/

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY

—OF—

BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS,

INCLUDING THE

PAPERS READ AND ABSTRACT OF PROCEEDINGS

—FOR—

JUNE AND DECEMBER, 1881.

The Society prints the papers read in full, but is not responsible for any opinions expressed therein.

On the Construction of Titus ii. 13.

BY PROF. EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL. D., CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The Greek reads as follows : προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μαχαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (or Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ).

Shall we translate, "the appearing of the glory of *our great God and Saviour* Jesus Christ"? or, "the appearing of the glory of *the great God and our Saviour* Jesus Christ"?

It was formerly contended by Granville Sharp, and afterwards by Bishop Middleton, that the absence of the Greek article before σωτῆρος in Tit. ii. 13 and 2 Pet. i. 1, and before θεοῦ in Eph. v. 5, is alone sufficient to prove that the two appellatives connected by καὶ belong to one subject.* "It is impossible," says Middleton in his note on Tit. ii. 13, "to understand θεοῦ and σωτῆρος otherwise than of one person." This ground is now generally abandoned, and it is ad-

---

*Sharp applied his famous rule also to 2 Thess. i. 12, but Middleton thinks that this text affords no certain evidence in his favor. Winer disposes of it summarily as merely a case in which κύριος is used for ὁ κύριος, the word κύριος taking, in a measure, the character of a proper name. In 2 Thess. i. 11, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν denotes God in distinction from "our Lord Jesus" (ver. 12); it is therefore unnatural in the extreme to take this title in the last clause of *the very same sentence* (ver. 12) as a designation of Christ. We may then reject without hesitation Granville Sharp's construction, which in fact has the support of but few respectable scholars.

As to 1 Tim. v. 21 and 2 Tim. iv. 1, it is enough to refer to the notes of Bishop Middleton and Bishop Ellicott on the former passage. Compare the remarkable various reading in Gal. ii. 20, adopted by Lachmann and Tregelles (text), but not by Tischendorf or Westcott and Hort,— ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ.

In Eph. v. 5, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ, the Χριστοῦ and θεοῦ are regarded as denoting distinct subjects by a large majority of the best commentators, as De Wette, Meyer, Oldshausen, Meier, Holzhausen, Flatt, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, Ewald, Schenkel, Braune and Riddle (in Lange's *Comm.*, Amer. trans.), Conybeare, Bloomfield, Ellicott, Eadie, Alford, Canon Barry in Ellicott's *N. T. Comm.*, and Prebendary Meyrick in "the Speaker's Commentary" (1881).

In the Revised New Testament, the construction contended for so strenuously by Middleton in Eph. v. 5, and by Sharp in 2 Thess. i. 12, has not been deemed worthy of notice.

mitted that, *grammatically*, either construction is possible.   I need only refer to Winer, Stuart, Buttmann, T. S. Green, and S. G. Green among the grammarians, and to Alford, Ellicott, Wace, and other recent commentators. †   It will be most convenient to assume, provisionally, that this view is corrrect ; and to consider first the *exegetical* grounds for preferring one construction to the other.   But as some still think that the omission of the article, though not decisive of the question, affords a *presumption* in favor of the construction which makes τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ a designation of Christ, a few remarks upon this point will be made in Note A, at the end of this paper.   It may be enough to say here, that θεοῦ has already an attributive, so that the mind naturally rests for a moment upon τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ as a subject by itself ; and that the addition of ᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ to σωτῆρος ἡμῶν distinguishes the person so clearly from τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ according to Paul's *constant use of language*, that there was no need of the article for that purpose.

The question presented derives additional interest from the fact that, in the recent Revision of the English translation of the New Testament, the English Company have adopted in the text the first of the constructions mentioned above, placing the other in the margin; while the American Company, by a large majority, preferred to reverse these positions.

I will first examine the arguments of Bishop Ellicott for the construction which makes τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ an appellation of Christ. They are as follows :

"(*a*) ἐπιφάνεια is a term specially and peculiarly applied to the Son, and never to the Father."   The facts are these.   In one passage (2 Tim. i. 10) the word ἐπιφάνεια is applied to Christ's first advent; in four to his second advent (2 Thess. ii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8); and as ἐπιφάνεια denotes a visible manifestation, it may be thought that an ἐπιφάνεια of God, the Father, "whom no man hath seen nor can see," could not be spoken of.

But this argument is founded on a misstatement of the question. The expression here is not "the appearing *of the great God*," but "the appearing *of the glory* of the great God," which is a very different thing.   When our Saviour himself had said, "The Son of man

† See Winer, *Gram.* § 19, 5, Anm. 1, p. 123, 7te Aufl. (p. 130 Thayer's trans., p. 162 Moulton); Stuart, *Bibl. Repos.* April, 1834, vol. iv. p. 322 f.; A. Buttmann, *Gram.*, § 125, 14–17, pp. 97–100, Thayer's trans.; T. S. Green, *Gram. of the N. T. Dialect* (1842), pp. 205–219, or new ed. (1862), pp. 67–75; S. G. Green, *Handbook to the Gram. of the Greek Test.*, p. 216; and Alford on Tit. ii. 13.   Alford has some good remarks on the passage, but I find no sufficient proof of his statement that σωτήρ had become in the N. T. "a quasi proper name."

shall come *in the glory of his Father*, with his angels" (Matt. xvi. 27,
comp. Mark viii. 38), or as Luke expresses it, "in his own glory,
and the glory *of the Father*, and of the holy angels" (ch. ix. 26), can
we doubt that Paul, who had probably often heard Luke's report of
these words, might speak of "the appearing of the *glory*" of the Father,
as well as of Christ, at the second advent?*

This view is confirmed by the representations of the second advent
given elsewhere in the New Testament, and particularly by 1 Tim.
vi. 14–16. The future ἐπιφάνεια of Christ was not conceived of by
Paul as independent of God, the Father, any more than his first
ἐπιφάνεια or advent, but as one "which in his own time the blessed
and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who only
hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable, whom no man
hath seen nor can see, *shall show*" (δείξει). The reference is to the
joint manifestation of the glory of God and of Christ at the time
when, to use the language of the writer to the Hebrews (i. 6), "he
again bringeth [or *shall have brought*] the first-begotten into the world,
and saith, Let all the angels of God pay him homage." That
God and Christ should be associated in the references to the second
advent, that God should be represented as displaying his power and
glory at the ἐπιφάνεια of Christ, accords with the account given else-
where of the *accompanying events*. The dead are to be raised at the
second advent, a glorious display of divine power, even as Christ is
said to have been "raised from the dead by the *glory* of the Father"
(Rom. vi. 4). But it is expressly declared by Paul that "as Jesus
died and rose again, even so shall GOD, *through* Jesus, bring with him
them that have fallen asleep" (1 Thess. iv. 14; comp. Phil. iii. 21);
and again, "GOD both raised the Lord, and will raise up us by his
power" (1 Cor. vi. 14). There is to be a general judgment at
the second advent; but Paul tells us that "God hath appointed a day

---

* Even if the false assumption on which the argument is founded
were correct, that is, if the expression here used were τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ
μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the argument would
have little or no weight. The fact that ἐπιφάνεια is used four times of
Christ in relation to the second advent, would be very far from proving
that it might not be so used of God, the Father, also. Abundant exam-
ples may be adduced from Jewish writers to show that any extraordi-
nary display of divine power, whether exercised directly and known only
by its effects, or through an intermediate visible agent, as an angel,
might be called an ἐπιφάνεια, an "appearing" or "manifestation" of God.
The word is used in the same way in heathen literature to denote any
supposed divine interposition in human affairs, whether accompanied by
a visible appearance of the particular deity concerned, or not. See
Note B.

in which HE will judge the world in righteousness *by* a man whom he hath ordained" (Acts xvii. 31), or, as it is elsewhere expressed, "the day in which HE will judge the secrets of men, *through* Jesus Christ" (Rom. ii. 16, comp. ver. 5, 6); and that "we shall all stand before the judgment seat of GOD" (Rom. xiv. 10).   So the day referred to is not only called "the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. i. 8; v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14), or "the day of Christ Jesus" (Phil. i. 6), or "the day of Christ" (Phil. i. 10; ii. 16), but "the day of GOD" (2 Pet. iii. 12).   Here, as throughout the economy of salvation, there is εἷς θεός, ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ εἷς κύριος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα (1 Cor. viii. 6).

It appears to me, then, that Bishop Ellicott's "palmary argument," as he calls it, derives all its apparent force from a misstatement of the question; and when we consider the express language of Christ respecting his appearing in the glory of his Father; the express statement of Paul that this ἐπιφάνεια of Christ is one which God, the Father, will *show* (1 Tim. vi. 15), and the corresponding statement of the writer to the Hebrews (i. 6, "when he again bringeth," etc.); when we consider that in the *concomitants* of the second advent, the resurrection of the dead, and the judgment of men, in which the glory of Christ will be displayed, he is everywhere represented as acting, not independently of God, the Father, but in union with him, as his agent, so that "the Father is glorified in the Son," can we find the slightest difficulty in supposing that Paul here describes the second advent as an "appearing of the *glory* of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ"?

(*b*) Bishop Ellicott's second argument is, "that the immediate context so specially relates to our Lord."—He can only refer to ver. 14, "who gave himself for us," etc.   The argument rests on the assumption, that when a writer speaks of two persons, A and B, there is something strange or unnatural in adding a predicate of B alone. If it is not instantly clear that such an assumption contradicts the most familiar facts of language, one may compare the mention of God and Christ together in Gal. i. 3, 4, and 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6, and the predicate that in each case follows the mention of the latter.   The passage in Galatians reads: "Grace to you and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might deliver us," etc.

(*c*) The third point is, "that the following mention of Christ's giving Himself up for us, of His abasement, does fairly account for St. Paul's ascription of a title, otherwise unusual, that specially and antithetically marks His glory."—"Otherwise *unusual*"!   Does

Bishop Ellicott mean that "the great God" is simply an "unusual" title of Christ in the New Testament? But this is not an argument, but only an answer to an objection, which we shall consider by and by. It is obvious that what is said in ver. 14 can in itself afford no proof or presumption that Paul in what precedes has called Christ "the great God." He uses similar language in many passages (*e. g.* those just cited under *b* from Gal. i. 3, 4 and 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6) in which Christ is clearly distinguished from God.

(*d*) The fourth argument is, " that μεγάλου would seem uncalled for if applied to the Father." It seems to me, on the contrary, to have a solemn impressiveness, suitable to the grandeur of the event referred to. It condenses into one word what is more fully expressed by the accumulation of high titles applied to God in connection with the same subject in 1 Tim. vi. 14–16, suggesting that the event is one in which the power and majesty of God will be conspicuously displayed. The expression "the great God" does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, but it is not uncommon in the Old Testament and later Jewish writings as a designation of Jehovah. See Note C.

(*e*) Bishop Ellicott's last argument is, that "apparently two of the Ante-Nicene (Clem. Alexand. *Protrept.* 7 [ed. Pott.] and Hippolytus, quoted by Words.) and the great bulk of post-Nicene writers concurred in this interpretation."—As to this, I would say that Clement of Alexandria does not cite the passage in proof of the deity of Christ, and there is nothing to show that he adopted the construction which refers the τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ to him.* Hippolytus (*De Antichristo* c. 67), in an *allusion* to the passage, uses the expression ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν of Christ, which may seem to indicate that he adopted the construction just mentioned. But it is to be observed that he omits the τῆς δόξης, and the μεγάλου, and the

---

*Winstanley well remarks, in his valuable essay on the use of the Greek article in the New Testament, that "the observation of Whitby that Clem. Alex. quotes this text of St. Paul, when he is asserting the divinity of Christ, if it mean that he quotes it as an argument, or proof, is a mistake. Clemens is all along speaking of a past appearance only, and therefore he begins his quotation with a former verse, ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ . . . etc., and then proceeds τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἄσμα τὸ καινόν [I omit the quotation], etc., so that his authority inclines the other way: for he has not appealed to this text, though he had it before him, when he was expressly asserting the divinity of Christ, as θεός, and ὁ θεὸς λόγος, but not as ὁ μέγας θεός." (*Vindication of certain Passages in the Common English Version of the N. T.*, p. 35 f., Amer. ed., Cambridge, 1819.)

The supposition of Wordsworth and Wace that Ignatius (*Eph.* c. 1) refers to this passage has, so far as I can see, no foundation.

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ after σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, so that it is not certain that if he had quoted the passage fully, instead of merely borrowing some of its language, he would have applied all the terms to one subject. My principal reason for doubt is, that he has nowhere in his writings spoken of Christ as ὁ μέγας θεός, with or without ἡμῶν, and that it would hardly have been consistent with his theology to do this, holding so strongly as he did the doctrine of the subordination of the Son.

It is true that many writers of the fourth century and later apply the passage to Christ. At that period, and earlier, when θεός had become a common appellation of Christ, and especially when he was very often called "our God" or "our God and Saviour," the construction of Tit. ii. 13 which refers the θεοῦ to him would seem the most natural. But the *New Testament* use of language is widely different ; and on that account a construction which would seem most natural in the fourth century, might not even suggest itself to a reader of the first century. That the orthodox Fathers should give to an ambiguous passage the construction which suited their theology and the use of language in their time, was almost a matter of course, and furnishes no evidence that their resolution of the ambiguity is the true one.

The cases are so numerous in which the Fathers, under the influence of a dogmatic bias, have done extreme violence to very plain language, that we can attach no weight to their preference in the case of a construction really ambiguous, like the present. For a notable example of such violence, see 2 Cor. iv. 4, ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, where, through fear of Gnosticism or Manichæism, Irenæus (*Hær.* iii. 7. § 1; comp. iv. 29 (al. 48). § 2), Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* v. 11), Adamantius or Pseudo-Origen (*De recta in Deum fide,* sect. ii. Orig. *Opp.* i. 832), Chrysostom, Theodoret, Œcumenius, Theophylact, Augustine, Primasius, Sedulius Scotus, Haymo, and others make τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου depend on ἀπίστων instead of ὁ θεός,* a construction which we should hardly hesitate to call impossible.

I have now considered all the arguments of Bishop Ellicott, citing them in full in his own language. It seems to me that no one of them has any real weight ; and that a consideration of his "palmary

---

* For many of these writers see Whitby, *Diss. de Script. Interp. secundum Patrum Commentarios,* p. 275 f. Alford's note on this passage has a number of false references, copied without acknowledgment from Meyer, and ascribes this interpretation (after Meyer) to Origen, who opposes it (*Opp.* iii. 497, ed. Delarue).

argument," which is the one mainly urged by the advocates of his construction of the passage, really leads to the opposite view. The same is true also, I conceive, of his reference to the expression "the great God."

But there is a new argument which it may be worth while to notice. In the English translation of the second edition of his *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N. T. Greek*, Cremer has added to the article θεός a long note on Tit. ii. 13 which is not in the German original, and has made other alterations in the article. He here contends that τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ refers to Christ. He gives up entirely the argument from the want of the article before σωτῆρος, on which he had insisted in the German edition. Nor does he urge the argument from the use of ἐπιφάνεια. His only arguments are founded on the assertion that ver. 14 "by its form already indicates that in ver. 13 only one subject is presented"—an argument which has already been answered (see p. 6, under *b*), and to which, it seems to me, one cannot reasonably attach the slightest weight—and the fact that ver. 14 contains the expression λαὸς περιούσιος, "a peculiar people," an expression used in the O. T. to denote the Jewish nation as the chosen people, the peculiar possession of God. The argument rests on the assumption that because in ver. 14 the Apostle has transferred this expression to the church of Christ, "the great God" in ver. 13 must be taken as a predicate of Christ.

The case seems to me to present no difficulty, and to afford no ground for such an inference. The relation of Christians to God and Christ is such that, from its very nature, the servants of Christ are and are called the servants of God, the church of Christ the church of God, the kingdom of Christ the kingdom of God. So Christians are and are represented as the peculiar people and possession of Christ, and at the same time the peculiar people and possession of God (1 Pet. ii. 9, 10).* If Christians belong to Christ, they must belong also to God, the Father, to whom Christ himself belongs (1 Cor. iii. 23, "ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's"). To infer, then, that because in ver. 14 Christians are spoken of as Christ's peculiar people, the title "great God" must necessarily be understood as applied to him in ver. 13, is a very extraordinary kind of reasoning.

---

* Comp. Clement of Rome, 1 *Ep. ad Cor.* c. 64 (formerly 58): " May the All-seeing God and Master of Spirits and Lord of all flesh, who chose the Lord Jesus Christ and *us through him for a peculiar people* (εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον), grant," etc.

Such are the arguments which have been urged for the translation, "the appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." Let us now consider what is to be said for the construction which makes τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ and 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ distinct subjects.

In the case of a grammatical ambiguity of this kind in any classical author, the first inquiry would be, What is the usage of the writer respecting the application of the title in question? Now this consideration, which certainly is a most reasonable one, seems to me here absolutely decisive. While the word θεός occurs more than five hundred times in the Epistles of Paul, not including the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is not a single instance in which it is *clearly* applied to Christ. †

In the case then of a question between two constructions, either of which is grammatically possible, should we not adopt that which accords with a usage of which we have 500 examples, without one clear exception, rather than that which is in opposition to it? The case is made still stronger by the fact that we have here not only θεοῦ, but μεγάλου θεοῦ.

---

† The passages in the writings of Paul in which the title θεός has ever been supposed to be given to Christ are very few, and are all cases of very doubtful construction or doubtful reading. Alford finds it given to him only in Rom. ix. 5; but here, as is well known, many of the most eminent modern scholars make the last part of the verse a doxology to God, the Father. So, for example, Winer, Fritzsche, Meyer, De Wette, Ewald; Tischendorf, Kuenen and Cobet, Buttmann, Hahn (ed. 1861); Prof. Jowett, Prof. I. H. Godwin, Prof. Lewis Campbell of the University of St. Andrews, the Rev. Dr. B. H. Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, and Dr. Hort. Of the other passages, Eph. v. 5 and 2 Thess. i. 12 have already been considered. In 1 Tim. iii. 16 there is now a general agreement among critical scholars that ὃς ἐφανερώθη and not θεὸς ἐφανερώθη is the true reading. In Col. ii. 2, the only remaining passage, the text is uncertain; but if we adopt the reading τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ Χριστοῦ, the most probable construction is that which regards Χριστοῦ as in apposition with μυστηρίου, which is confirmed by Col. i. 27. This is the view of Bishop Ellicott, Bishop Lightfoot, Wieseler (on Gal. i. 1), and Westcott and Hort. Others, as Meyer and Huther, translate "the mystery of the God of Christ" (comp. Eph. i. 3, 17, etc.) Steiger takes Χριστοῦ as in apposition with τοῦ θεοῦ, and thus finds Christ here called God; but to justify his interpretation the Greek should rather be Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (comp. De Wette).

The habitual, and I believe *uniform*, usage of Paul corresponds with his language 1 Cor. viii. 6.

Here and elsewhere I intentionally pass by the question whether Paul's view of the nature of Christ and his relation to the Father would have allowed him to designate Christ as ὁ μέγας θεὸς καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν. This would lead to a long discussion of many passages. My argument rests on the undisputed facts respecting his habitual use of language.

Even if we do not regard the Pastoral Epistles as written by Paul, and confine our attention to them only, we reach the same result. Observe how clearly God, the Father, is distinguished from Christ in 1 Tim. i. 1, 2 ; ii. 3–5 ; v. 21; vi. 13–16 ; 2 Tim. i. 2, 8, 9 ; iv. 1; Tit. i. 1, 3 (comp. for the *κατ' ἐπιταγήν* 1 Tim. i. 1, Rom. xvi. 26), 4; iii. 4–6.   Observe, particularly, that the expression "God our Saviour" is applied solely to the Father, who is distinguished from Christ as our Saviour; God being the primal source of salvation, and Christ the medium of communication, agreeably to the language of Paul, 2 Cor. v. 18, *τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ*; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 6.   See 1 Tim. i. 1; ii. 3–5; iv. 10; Tit. i. 1–4; iii. 4–6; compare also Jude 25.   Such being the marked distinction between *θεός* and *Χριστός* in other passages of these Pastoral Epistles, should we not adopt the construction which recognizes the same here ?

An examination of the context will confirm the conclusion at which we have arrived.   I have already shown that the title "God our Saviour" in the Pastoral Epistles belongs exclusively to the Father.   This is generally admitted ; for example, by Bloomfield, Alford, and Ellicott.   Now the connection of ver. 10, in which this expression occurs, with ver. 11 is obviously such, that if *θεοῦ* denotes the Father in the former it must in the latter.   Regarding it then as settled that *θεοῦ* in ver. 11 denotes the Father (and I am not aware that it has ever been disputed),* is it not harsh to suppose that the *θεοῦ* in ver. 13, in the latter part of the sentence, denotes a different subject from the *θεοῦ* in ver. 11, at the beginning of the same sentence ?   It appears especially harsh, when we notice the beautiful correspondence of *ἐπιφάνειαν* in ver. 13 with the *ἐπεφάνη* of ver. 11. This correspondence can hardly have been undesigned.   As the first advent of Christ was an *appearing* or visible manifestation of the *grace* of God, who sent him, so his second advent will be an *appearing* of the *glory* of God, as well as of Christ.

To sum up : the reasons which are urged for giving this verbally ambiguous passage the construction which makes "the great God" a designation of Christ, are seen, when examined, to have little or no weight ; on the other hand, the construction adopted in the common English version, and preferred by the American Revisers, is favored, if not required, by the context (comparing ver. 13 with ver. 11); it perfectly suits the references to the second advent in other

---

*If it should be questioned, all doubt will probably be removed by a comparison of the verse with Tit. iii. 3–7, and 2 Tim. i. 8, 9.

parts of the N. T.; and it is imperatively demanded by a regard to Paul's *use of language*, unless we arbitrarily assume here a single exception to a usage of which we have more than 500 examples.

I might add, though I would not lay much stress on the fact, that the principal ancient versions, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshitto and Harclean Syriac, the Coptic, and the Arabic, appear to have given the passage the construction which makes God and Christ distinct subjects. The Ethiopic seems to be the only exception. Perhaps, however, the construction in the Latin versions should be regarded as somewhat ambiguous.

Among the modern scholars who have agreed with all the old English versions (Tyndale, Coverdale, Cranmer, the Genevan, the Bishops' Bible, the Rhemish, and the Authorized) in preferring this construction, are Erasmus, Calvin, Luther, Grotius, LeClerc, Wetstein, Moldenhawer, Michaelis, Benson, Macknight, Abp. Newcome, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Schott, Bretschneider, Neander (*Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, Robinson's revised trans., p. 468, note †), De Wette (and so Möller in the 3d ed. of De Wette, 1867), Meyer (on Rom. ix. 5), Fritzsche (*Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 266 ff.), Grimm, Baumgarten-Crusius (*N. T. Gr.* ed. Schott, 1839), Krehl, H. F. T. L. Ernesti (*Vom Ursprunge der Sünde*, p. 235 f.), Schumann (*Christus*, 1852, ii. 580, note), Messner (*Die Lehre der Apostel*, 1856, p. 236 f.), Huther, Ewald, Holtzmann (in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, and with more hesitation in his *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 1880), Beyschlag (*Christol. des N. T.*, 1866, p. 212, note), Rothe (*Dogmatik*, II. i. (1870), p. 110, note 3), Conybeare and Howson, Alford, Fairbairn, with some hesitation (*The Pastoral Epistles*, Edin. 1874, pp. 55, 282–285), Davidson, Prof. Lewis Campbell (in the *Contemp. Rev.* for Aug., 1876), Immer (*Theol. d. N. T.*, 1877, p. 393), W. F. Gess, *Christi Person und Werk*, Abth. II. (1878), p. 330), in opposition to the view expressed in his earlier work, *Die Lehre von der Person Christi* (1856), p. 88 f., Reuss (*Les Épitres Pauliniennes*, Paris, 1878, ii. 345), Farrar (*Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 536, cf. p. 615, note 1); Westcott and Hort, apparently, according to the punctuation of their text, as distinguished from that of their margin; and so the grammarians Winer and T. S. Green (comp. his *Twofold N. T.*). In the case of one or two recent writers, as Pfleiderer and Weizsäcker, who have adopted the other construction, there is reason to regard them as influenced by their view of the non-Pauline authorship of the Epistle, disposing them to find in its Christology a doctrine different from that of Paul.

Very many others, as Heydenreich, Flatt, Tholuck (*Comm. zum*

Brief an die Römer, 5e Ausg., 1856, p. 482), C. F. Schmid (*Bibl. Theol. des N. T.*, 2e Aufl., p. 540), Luthardt, leave the matter unde-cided. Even Bloomfield, in the Addenda to his last work (*Critical Annotations, Additional and Supplementary, on the N. T.*, Lond. 1860, p. 352), after retracting the version given in his 9th edition of the Greek Testament, candidly says: "I am ready to admit that the mode of interpreting maintained by Huther and Al[ford] completely satisfies all the grammatical requirements of the sentence ; that it is both structurally and contextually quite as probable as the other, and perhaps more agreeable to the Apostle's way of writing."

The view of Lange (*Christliche Dogmatik*, Heidelb. 1851, ii. 161 f.), Van Hengel (*Interp. Ep. Pauli ad Romanos*, ii. 358, note), and Schenkel (*Das Christusbild der Apostel*, 1879, p. 357), that Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is here in apposition to τῆς δόξης, the words which precede (τοῦ μεγ. θεοῦ καὶ σωτ. ἡμῶν) being referred to the Father, has so little to commend it that it may be passed over without discussion.

———•◆•———

NOTE A.—(See p. 4.)

On the Omission of the Article before σωτῆρος ἡμῶν.

Middleton's rule is as follows:—"When two or more attributives joined by a copulative or copulatives are assumed of [assumed to belong to] the same person or thing, before the first attributive the article is inserted; before the remaining ones it is omitted." (*Doctrine of the Greek Article*, Chap. III. Sect. IV. § 2, p. 44, Amer. edition.) If the article is not inserted before the second of the two assumable attribut-ives thus connected, he maintains that both must be understood as describing the same subject.

By attributives he understands adjectives, participles, and nouns which are "significant of *character, relation,* or *dignity.*"

He admits that the rule is not always applicable to *plurals* (p. 49); and again, where the attributives "are in their nature plainly incompat-ible." "We cannot wonder," he says, "if in such instances the principle of the rule has been sacrificed to negligence, or even to studied brevity. . . . The second article should in strictness be expressed; but in such cases the writers knew that it might be safely understood." (pp. 51, 52.)

The *principle* which covers all the cases coming under Middleton's rule, so far as that rule bears on the present question, is, I believe, sim-ply this: The definite article is inserted before the second attributive when it is *felt to be needed to distinguish different subjects ;* but when

the two terms connected by a copulative are *shown by any circumstance* to denote distinct subjects, then the article may be omitted, for the excellent reason that it is not needed.*

Middleton's rule, with its exceptions, applies to the English language as well as to the Greek.   Webster (Wm.) remarks in his *Syntax and Synonyms of the Greek Testament :—*

"In English, the Secretary and Treasurer means one person ; the Secretary and the Treasurer mean two persons.   In speaking of horses, the black and white means the piebald, but the black and the white mean two different horses."   (pp. 35, 36.)

But this rule is very often broken when such formal precision of expression is not felt to be necessary.   If I should say, "I saw the President and Treasurer of the Boston and Albany Railroad yesterday," no one, probably, would doubt that I spoke of two different persons, or (unless perhaps Mr. G. Washington Moon) would imagine that I was violating the laws of the English language.   The fact that the two offices referred to are generally or always in such corporations held by different persons would prevent any doubt as to the meaning.   Again, the remark that "Mr. A. drove out to-day with his black and white horses" would be perfectly correct English and perfectly unambiguous if addressed to one who *knew* that Mr. A. had only four horses, two of them black and the other two white.

Take an example from the New Testament.   In Matt. xxi. 12 we read that Jesus "cast out all those that were selling and buying in the temple," $\tau o \grave{\upsilon}\varsigma \; \pi \omega \lambda o \tilde{\upsilon}\nu \tau \alpha \varsigma \; \varkappa \alpha \grave{\imath} \; \dot{\alpha}\gamma o \rho \acute{\alpha}\zeta o \nu \tau \alpha \varsigma$.   No one can reasonably suppose that the same persons are here described as both selling and buying. In Mark the two classes are made distinct by the insertion of $\tau o \grave{\upsilon}\varsigma$ before $\dot{\alpha}\gamma o \rho \acute{\alpha}\zeta o \nu \tau \alpha \varsigma$; here it is safely left to the intelligence of the reader to distinguish them.

In the case before us, the omission of the article before $\sigma \omega \tau \tilde{\eta}\rho o \varsigma$ seems to me to present no difficulty; not because $\sigma \omega \tau \tilde{\eta}\rho o \varsigma$ is made sufficiently definite by the addition of $\dot{\eta}\mu \tilde{\omega}\nu$ (Winer), for, since God as well as Christ is often called "our Saviour," $\dot{\eta} \; \delta \acute{o}\xi \alpha \; \tau o \tilde{\upsilon} \; \mu \varepsilon \gamma \acute{\alpha}\lambda o \upsilon \; \theta \varepsilon o \tilde{\upsilon} \; \varkappa \alpha \grave{\imath} \; \sigma \omega \tau \tilde{\eta}\rho o \varsigma \; \dot{\eta}\mu \tilde{\omega}\nu$, *standing alone*, would most naturally be understood of one subject, namely, God, the Father; but the addition of $\text{'}I\eta \sigma o \tilde{\upsilon} \; X \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \tilde{\upsilon}$ to $\sigma \omega \tau \tilde{\eta}\rho o \varsigma$ $\dot{\eta}\mu \tilde{\omega}\nu$ changes the case entirely, restricting the $\sigma \omega \tau \tilde{\eta}\rho o \varsigma \; \dot{\eta}\mu \tilde{\omega}\nu$ to a person or being who, according to Paul's *habitual use of language*, is distinguished from the person or being whom he designates as $\dot{o} \; \theta \varepsilon \acute{o}\varsigma$, so that there was no need of the repetition of the article to prevent ambiguity.   So in 2 Thess. i. 12, the expression $\varkappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \; \tau \grave{\eta}\nu \; \chi \acute{\alpha}\rho \iota \nu \; \tau o \tilde{\upsilon} \; \theta \varepsilon o \tilde{\upsilon} \; \dot{\eta}\mu \tilde{\omega}\nu \; \varkappa \alpha \grave{\imath} \; \varkappa \upsilon \rho \acute{\iota}o \upsilon$ would naturally be understood of one subject, and the article would be

---

* See the remarks (by Andrews Norton) in the Appendix to the American edition of Winstanley's *Vindication of Certain Passages in the Common Eng. Version of the N. T.*, p. 45 ff.; or Norton's *Statement of Reasons*, &c., 2d ed., (1856), pp. 199–202.

required before κυρίου if two were intended; but the simple addition of
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ to κυρίου makes the reference to the two distinct subjects
clear without the insertion of the article.

But the omission of the article before the second of two subjects con-
nected by καί is not without effect. Its absence naturally leads us to
conceive of them as united in some common relation, while the repetition
of the article would present them to the mind as distinct objects of
thought. The difference between the two cases is like the difference
between the expressions " the kingdom of Christ and God," and " the
kingdom of Christ and of God " in English. The former expression
would denote one kingdom, belonging in some sense to both ; the latter
would permit the supposition that two distinct kingdoms were referred
to, though it would not require this interpretation. The repetition of
the preposition, however, as of the article, brings the subjects separately
before the mind. In the present case, the omission of the article before
σωτῆρος, conjoining the word closely with θεοῦ, may indicate that the
glory spoken of belongs in one aspect to God and in another to Christ
(comp. Eph. v. 5); or that the glory of God and the glory of Christ are
displayed in conjunction (comp. 2 Thess. i. 12, κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ
ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰ. Χ.; Luke ix. 26).

There may be still another reason for the omission of the article here
before σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, or, perhaps I should say, another effect of its
absence. It is a recognized principle that the omission of the article
before an appellative which designates a person tends to fix the attention
on the quality or character or peculiar relation expressed by the appel-
lative, while the insertion of the article tends to throw into the shade the
inherent meaning of the term, and to give it the force of a simple proper
name. For example, in Heb. i. 2 ἐν τῷ υἱῷ would simply mean " in
(or by) the Son," or " his Son ; " but the omission of the article (ἐν υἱῷ)
emphasizes the significance of the term υἱός,—" by one who is a Son,"
and in virtue of what that designation expresses is far above all " the
prophets." (Comp. T. S. Green, Gram. of the N. T., 2d ed., pp. 47 f.,
38 f.) So here the meaning may be, " the appearing of the glory of the
great God and a Saviour of us," one who is our Saviour, " Jesus
Christ "—essentially equivalent to " of the great God and Jesus Christ as
our Saviour ; " (comp. Acts xiii. 23); the idea suggested being that the
salvation or deliverance of Christians will be consummated at the second
advent, when Christ " shall appear, to them that wait for him, unto sal-
vation." Comp. Phil. iii. 20, 21, " For our citizenship is in heaven, from
whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ
σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, who shall change the body
of our humiliation," &c.; Rom. viii. 23, 24; xiii. 11; 1 Thess. v. 8, 9;
Heb. ix. 28; 1 Pet. i. 5. The position of σωτῆρος ἡμῶν before Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ, as well as the absence of the article, favors this view; comp.
Acts xiii. 23; Phil. iii. 20, and contrast Tit. i. 4.

The points which I would make, then, are, that the insertion of the article before σωτῆρος was not needed here to show that the word designates a subject distinct from τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ; and that its absence serves to bring out the thoughts that, in the event referred to, the glory of God and that of Christ are displayed *together*, and that Christ then appears as *Saviour*, in the sense that the salvation of Christians, including what St. Paul calls "the redemption of the body," is then made complete. These are conceptions which accord with the view which the Apostle has elsewhere presented of the second advent.

But as many English writers still assume that the construction of Tit. ii. 13 and similar passages has been settled by Bishop Middleton, I will quote in conclusion a few sentences, by way of caution, from one of the highest authorities on the grammar of the Greek Testament, Alexander Buttmann. He says :—

" It will probably never be possible, either in reference to profane literature or to the N. T., to bring down to rigid rules which have no exception, the inquiry when with several substantives connected by conjunctions the article is repeated, and when it is not. . . . From this fact alone it follows, that in view of the subjective and arbitrary treatment of the article on the part of individual writers (cf. § 124, 2) it is very hazardous in particular cases to draw important inferences affecting the sense or even of a doctrinal nature, from the single circumstance of the use or omission of the article ; see e. g. Tit. ii. 13 ; Jude 4 ; 2 Pet. i. 1 and the expositors of these passages." (*Gram. of the N. T. Greek*, § 125, 14 ; p. 97, Thayer's trans.)

NOTE B. (See p. 5.)

The use of ἐπιφάνεια and kindred terms with reference to God.

It has already been observed that the expression used in Tit. ii. 13 is not ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ, but ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ, and that the reference of the title "the great God" to the Father accords perfectly with the representation elsewhere in the N. T., that *the glory* of God, the Father, as well as of Christ, will be displayed at the second advent. This reference, therefore, presents no difficulty. But the weakness of the argument against it may be still further illustrated by the use of the term ἐπιφάνεια and kindred expressions in Josephus and other Jewish writings. It will be seen that any extraordinary manifestation of divine power, whether exerted directly, or through an intermediate agent, is spoken of as an ἐπιφάνεια of God.

1. For example, the parting of the waters of the Red Sea is described as "the appearing" or "manifestation of God." Μωϋσῆς δὲ ὁρῶν τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ θεοῦ κ. τ. λ. Joseph. *Ant.* ii. 16. § 2.

2.   Speaking of the journey through the wilderness, Josephus says: "The cloud was present, and standing over the tabernacle, signified *the appearing of God*," τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ θεοῦ.   (*Ant.* iii. 14. § 4.)

3.   Josephus uses both ἡ παρουσία τοῦ θεοῦ, and ἡ ἐπιφάνεια [τοῦ θεοῦ], in reference to a miraculous shower of rain; *Ant.* xviii. 8 (al. 10). § 6.   So a violent thunderstorm which deterred the army of Xerxes from attacking Delphi is described by Diodorus Siculus as ἡ τῶν θεῶν ἐπιφάνεια (*Bibl. Hist.* xi. 14).   Comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 11 (al. 14). § 7, where ἡ ἐμφάνεια τοῦ θεοῦ is used in a similar way.   Observe also how in Herod's speech (*Ant.* xv. 5 (al. 6). § 3) angels are spoken of as bringing God εἰς ἐμφάνειαν to men.

4.   ·In reference to the miraculous guidance of Abraham's servant when sent to procure Rebecca as a wife for Isaac, the marriage is said to have been brought about ὑπὸ θείας ἐπιφανείας, where we might say, "by a divine interposition." (Joseph. *Ant.* i. 16. § 3.)

5.   After giving an account of the deliverance of Elisha from the troops sent by Ben-Hadad to arrest him, which were struck with blindness, Josephus says that the king "marvelled at the strange event, and the *appearing* (or *manifestation*) and power of the God of the Israelites (τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ δύναμιν), and at the prophet with whom the Deity was so evidently present for help."   (*Ant.* ix. 4. § 4.)   Elijah had prayed that God would "*manifest* (ἐμφανίσαι) his power and *presence*," παρουσίαν.   (*Ibid.* § 3.)

6.   In Josephus, *Ant.* v. 8. §§ 2, 3, the appearance of *an angel sent by God* is described as "a sight of God," ἐκ τῆς ὄψεως τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν θεὸν αὐτοῖς ὁραθῆναι.

7.   In 2 Macc. iii. 24, in reference to the horse with the terrible rider, and the angels that scourged Heliodorus, we read, ὁ τῶν πατέρων [al. πνευμάτων] κύριος καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης ἐπιφάνειαν μεγάλην ἐποίησεν, and in ver. 30, τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπιφανέντος κυρίου, "the Almighty Lord *having appeared*," and farther on, ver. 34, Heliodorus is spoken of as having been "scourged *by him*," ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, *i. e.* the Lord, according to the common text, retained by Grimm and Keil.   But here for ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Fritzsche reads ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, which looks like a gloss (comp. ii. 21, τὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενομένας ἐπιφανείας).

8.   The sending of a good angel is described as an ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Macc. xv. 27, comp. ver. 22, 23.   Observe also that in 2 Macc. xv. 34 and 3 Macc. v. 35 τὸν ἐπιφανῆ κύριον or θεόν does not mean "the *glorious* Lord (*or* God)" as it has often been misunderstood, but ἐπιφανής designates God as one who *manifests* his power in the deliverance of his people, a present help in time of need, "the interposing God" (Bissell).   Compare the note of Valesius (Valois) on Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 6. § 2.

9.   See also 2 Macc. xii. 22, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πάντα ἐφορῶντος ἐπιφανείας γενομένου ἐπ' αὐτούς ; comp. 2 Macc. xi. 8, 10, 13.

10. "They made application to him who . . . always helpeth his portion [his people] μετ' ἐπιφανείας," 2 Macc. xiv. 15.

11. In 3 Macc. v. 8, we are told that the Jews "besought the Almighty Lord to rescue them from imminent death μετὰ μεγαλομεροῦς ἐπιφανείας," and again, ver. 51, " to take pity on them μετὰ ἐπιφανείας." The answer to the prayer is represented as made by the intervention of angels, vi. 18. In ch. i. 9, God is spoken of as having glorified Jerusalem ἐν ἐπιφανείᾳ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ.

12. In the Additions to Esther, Text B, vii. 6 (Fritzsche, *Libr. Apoc. V. T.* p. 71), the sun and light in Mordecai's dream are said to represent the ἐπιφανία τοῦ θεοῦ, " appearing" (*or* manifestation) " of God" in the deliverance of the Jews.

13. In the so-called Second Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, c. 12, § 1, we read : " Let us therefore wait hourly [*or* betimes, *Lightf.*] for the kingdom of God in love and righteousness, because we know not the day *of the appearing of God*, τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ θεοῦ." The τοῦ θεοῦ, employed thus absolutely, must, I think, refer to the Father, according to the writer's use of language. This consideration does not seem to me invalidated by c. 1, § 1, or by the use of ἐπιφάνεια in reference to Christ, c. 17 ; but others may think differently.

THE USE of the term ἐπιφάνεια in the later Greek classical writers corresponds with its use as illustrated above. Casaubon has a learned note on the word in his *Exercit. ad Annales Eccles. Baronianas* II. xi. Ann. I. Num. 36 (p. 185, Lond. 1614), in which he says: " Graeci scriptores ἐπιφάνειαν appellant apparitionem numinis *quoquo tandem modo deus aliquis suae praesentiae signum dedisse crederetur.*" (Comp. his note on Athenæus, xii. 11. al. 60.) Wesseling in his note on Diodorus Siculus i. 25 repeats this, and adds other illustrations from Diodorus, viz. iii. 62; iv. 82 [v. 62 ?]; xi. 14; and xiv. 69 (a striking example). See also the story of the Vestal virgin in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* ii. 68 (cf. 69), and of Servius Tullius, *ibid.* iv. 2. Other examples are given by Elsner, *Obss. Sacr.* on 2 Pet. i. 16, and by the writers to whom he refers. But it is not worth while to pursue this part of the subject further here. One who wishes to do so will find much interesting matter in the notes of the very learned Ezechiel Spanheim on Callimachus, *Hymn. in Apoll.* 13, and *in Pallad.* 101, and in his *Dissertationes de Præstantia et Usu Numismatum antiquorum*, ed. nova, vol. i. (Lond. 1706), Diss. vii. p. 425 sqq.

I WILL only add in conclusion: If Paul could speak of the first advent of Christ as an ἐπιφάνεια of the *grace* of God (see ἐπεφάνη Tit. ii. 11; iii. 4), can we, in view of all that has been said, regard it as in the least degree strange or unnatural that he should speak of his second advent as an ἐπιφάνεια of the *glory* of God?

NOTE C. (See p. 7.)

On the expression, τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ.

There is no other passage in the N. T. in which this expression occurs, the reading of the "received text" in Rev. xix. 17 having very slender support.   But the epithet "great" is so often applied to God in the Old Testament and later Jewish writings, and is so appropriate in connection with the display of the divine power and glory in the event referred to, that it is very wonderful that the use of the word here should be regarded as an argument for the reference of the θεός to Christ on the ground that " God the Father did not *need* the exalting and laudatory epithet μέγας," as Usteri says (*Paulin. Lehrbegriff*, 5 te Aufl., p. 326.   It might be enough to answer, with Fritzsche, " At ego putaveram, Deum quum *s i t magnus*, jure etiam *magnum a p p e l l a r i*" (*Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 268).   But the following references will show how naturally Paul might apply this designation to the Father :   Deut. viii. 21 (Sept. and Heb.); x. 17. 2 Chr. ii. 5 (4).   Neh. i. 5; vii. 6; ix. 32.   Ps. lxxvii. 13; lxxxvi. 10.   Jer. xxxii. 18,19.   Dan. ii. 45; ix. 4.   Psalt. Sal. ii. 33.   3 Macc. vii. 2.   Comp. ὁ μέγιστος θεός, 3 Macc. i. 16; iii. 11; v. 25; vii. 22; "the great Lord," Ecclus. xxxix. 6; xlvi. 5.   2 Macc. v. 20; xii. 15. So very often in the Sibylline Oracles; I have noted 31 examples in the Third Book alone, the principal part of which was the production of a Jewish writer in the second century before Christ.

Though all will agree that God, the Father, does not " need" exalting epithets, such epithets are applied to him freely by the Apostle Paul and other writers of the N. T.   For example, he is called by Paul " the incorruptible God," " the living God," " the eternal God," " the only wise God," "the only God," " the invisible God," " the living and true God," " the blessed God;" and since there is no other place in which the apostle has unequivocally designated Christ as θεός, much less θεός with a high epithet, it certainly seems most natural to suppose that ὁ μέγας θεός here designates the Father.   Professor Wace (in the " Speaker's Commentary") appeals to 1 John v. 20, where he assumes that Christ is designated as "the true God."   But he must be aware that this depends on the reference of the pronoun οὗτος, and that many of the best expositors refer this to the leading subject of the preceding sentence, namely, τὸν ἀληθινόν ; so e. g. Erasmus, Grotius, Wetstein, Michaelis, Lücke, DeWette, Meyer, Neander, Huther, Düsterdieck, Gerlach, Brückner, Ewald, Holtzmann, Braune, Haupt, Rothe, C. F. Schmid, Reuss, Alford, and Sinclair (in Ellicott's *N. T. Comm.*); and so the grammarians Alt, Winer, Wilke, Buttmann, aud Schirlitz; comp. also John xvii. 3.   So doubtful a passage, and that not in the writings of Paul but John, can hardly serve to render it probable that Paul has here applied the designation ὁ μέγας θεός to Christ rather than to God, the Father.

Note on I. Cor. vii. 15.

—◆—

BY PROF. E. P. GOULD.

—◆—

In regard to the question whether the permission to sepa-
rate, in this verse, leaves the believer who has been deserted by the
husband or wife free to marry again : Meyer says, yes ; because
Paul's permission in this case is based on the fact, necessary to his in-
terpretation of the Lord's command, that that command applies only
to cases in which both parties are believers, *i. e.*, that it is a Christian,
not a general law.   DeWette makes the same answer, though on the
entirely different ground that the case contemplated here, like the
one treated as an exception to his prohibition of divorce by our Lord,
is one in which the marriage tie is actually broken.   But, as regards
Meyer's position, it seems scarcely tenable that our Lord's command
is to be treated as merely Christian, and not general law.   For his
argument in Mt. 19 is based on the original relations of man and
woman, established at creation and inherent in their structure, and
must therefore be universal in its application, not limited to Chris-
tians.   It is true that in Mt. 5, Christ is laying down the law of his
kingdom, but that law is based on universal human relations and
obligations, and is applicable in all its parts to man as such.   And
in Mt. 19. Christ is discussing what is lawful under the Jewish dis-
pensation, but on the same general grounds.   As to De Wette's
position, that both in our Lord's treatment of the matter and in
Paul's, the exception to the law is reducible to an actual dissolution
of the marriage tie, which leaves the party divorced free, our Lord,
instead of leaving it so that the two cases can be classed together in
this way, himself draws the line between them, and declares that,
where there is divorce without adultery, he who marries the divorced
party commits adultery.   Our Lord does not consider divorce an
actual, but only a formal dissolution of the marriage tie.

On the whole, then, it seems that we can go just as far as the apostle does in his exception to the statement of our Lord, and no further. Because there is the line which separates between obedience and infraction of that law. The law is that marriage is a physical connection based on the physical relation of the sexes, and can be dissolved properly only physically and really, not formally. And hence to contract another marriage when there had been no such real dissolution, is, as our Lord says, to commit adultery, which is certainly applicable to this case. But what the apostle actually permits involves no infraction of the law on the part of the believer to whom he is speaking. For when he advises the Christian to allow the unbeliever to depart in order to avoid strife, it simply means that he is to accept the situation forced on him, he himself being passive in the matter. And it is important to notice that the apostle says not a word against the obligation of the unbelieving husband or wife to keep up the connection, but simply permits him to have his way, as something beyond the apostle's control. But if we may judge from what he commands in the case over which he as a Christian apostle does have control, we should say that he does not consider the action permitted to be morally right.

On Romans ix. 5.

—⋆—

BY PROF. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, D. D.

—⋆—

The English Version of 1611, as is well known, rendered this verse, "*Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ* came, *who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.*" As thus rendered, the verse has been regarded as asserting in the plainest terms the Divinity of our Lord, and has been used by theologians with much confidence and much emphasis in controversies with opponents. The Revised Version of 1881 gives a similar translation in its text: "*Whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.*" This Version, however, adds a marginal note in the following words: "Some modern interpreters place a full stop after *flesh,* and translate, *He who is God over all be (is) blessed forever;* or *He who is over all is God, blessed forever.* Others punctuate, *flesh, who is over all. God be (is) blessed forever.*" For this note, which is the suggestion of the Revision Company in England, the American Revisers propose to substitute, in accordance with the common form of expression adopted in such cases, the word *Or,* and to read, "*Or, flesh : he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever.*" The New Version, thus, recognises the possibility of a different rendering from that which it still retains from the old one, or, at least, acknowledges that a portion of the scholars of recent times have believed such a rendering to be correct. The ordinary reader of the English New Testament is now, accordingly, put in possession of what his fathers did not, in general, know—the fact that to some scholarly minds the words do not appear to declare the Divinity of Christ, or to assert that he is God over all blessed for ever.

The renewed examination of a passage of so much importance could scarcely be regarded as unsuitable at any time. Certainly it cannot be so at present, when the attention of all readers is called to the words by the added notes of the Revisers in both nations. The

questions may well be asked, Whether the rendering of the Old Ver-
sion ought to be retained in the new work ; whether, if retained, it
ought to be accompanied by a marginal note giving another explana-
tion ; and in what form this note, if added, ought to be expressed.
The most important , as well as the most interesting of these ques-
tions, however, is the one first mentioned.   Is the true translation of
the words of the Apostle that which we find in the text of the Re-
vised Version, or does some construction of the clause presented in
the margin deserve to be considered as the one originally intended ?

We should approach the consideration of this question, as it seems
to us, first as verbal and grammatical interpreters alone,—asking, apart
from all regard to St. Paul's doctrinal teaching, what the words before
us most naturally mean, in the connection in which they stand ; and
only afterwards should we take our view of them as looking from the
general doctrine of the Apostle.   This is the natural order of exam-
ination in all cases.   The words of a particular passage have a right
to be interpreted by the common rules of language, and to have their
meaning determined in independence of anything beyond the limits
of their own context.   A writer may not have intended to bring out,
in a particular place, what he states as the substance of his teaching
elsewhere.   He may even have a different view of truth at one time
from that which he has at another.   We owe it to him to take and
explain the sentence which he gives us to read, precisely as he gives
it.   This order, also, is the safest one.   By following it, we are least
exposed to those doctrinal pre-judgments which are so apt to make
us all partial and one-sided in our dealing with the words of Scrip-
ture.   But, while we look at the passage offered for examination at
first in this way, we fail in duty, when we undertake to interpret
a writer like St. Paul, unless, before our final decision, we inquire
whether the meaning assigned by us to what he says is out of har-
mony with the Christian doctrine which he teaches.

Proceeding after this manner, let us consider the verse under dis-
cussion in view of its words or phrases, and their natural connection
and construction.   To which of the renderings are we led as the
more probable one, or the only allowable one, when we pursue our
inquiries in this way ?   For convenience in our comparison, we select
the American marginal translation as the one to put in contrast with
that of the text, reserving what may be said upon the other sugges-
tions, in the English note, to a later point.   We propose, also, to
place the considerations favoring the translation in the text of the Re-
vised Version first in order, and to follow them with some suggestions
respecting those upon the opposite side of the question.

I.   It can hardly be denied, we think, that ὁ ὤν is more naturally
connected with ὁ Χριστός κ. τ. λ. as a descriptive clause, than with the
following words as the beginning of a new and independent sentence.
This construction of ὁ ὤν, in cases similar to that which is here pre-
sented, is the almost universal one both in the New Testament and
in other Greek.   In 2 Cor. xi. 31, for example, where the words
ὁ ὤν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας occur, as they do here, no one would
hesitate to refer them to ὁ θεός which precedes, even if they stood at
the end of the verse, or if the construction of the verse were so changed
as to read ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οἶδεν ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι, ὁ ὤν ἐπὶ πάντων
θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.   They would be thus referred, because
the mind naturally carries back the participial clause to πατήρ as if a
descriptive relative sentence.   That ὁ ὤν followed by other words
must always have this relative character, and cannot begin an inde-
pendent sentence as its subject, it is, of course, idle to assert.   Too
many instances in which the phrase is used in the latter way may be
cited at once, to allow any such position to be taken.   Cf. e. g. Matt.
xii. 30, Jno. iii. 31, viii. 47.   But the peculiarity of Rom. ix. 5, as
compared with such passages, lies in the fact, that in the clause im-
mediately preceding there is a prominent noun to which the phrase
is most easily joined, and a noun, also, designating a person of whom
a description in the way of praise might be readily expected.   Under
such circumstances the reader, as we cannot doubt, would find him-
self impelled to refer ὁ ὤν to this noun and this person.   The writer
would be aware, when he wrote, that this would be the impulse of
every one whose eye should chance to fall upon his words.   If, there-
fore, he did not design this reference to be made, he would, we must
believe, have been careful to avoid the danger—we may almost say,
the certainty—of it, by adopting another construction for his sentence,
which would be exposed to no such misapprehension.   Especially
would this have been the case, where a misunderstanding would
be attended with a wrong conception of a most important truth.
While we admit, then, the possibility that ὁ ὤν opens an entirely new
sentence, we think it cannot be denied that the *presumption* lies in
favor of the view which connects this phrase with χριστός, and that
the *burden of proof* is on the side of those who would reject this view.

   This presumption and the consequent burden of proof are those
which we find, at this point, upon the grammatical side of the ques-
tion, and apart from the Apostle's doctrinal teaching.   The fact of
their existence is worthy of serious consideration, as we attempt to
decide upon the meaning of the verse.   Undoubtedly, however, too
much stress may be laid upon this fact.   Not only so, but it must be

admitted that more weight has been given to it by some writers than a due estimate of its importance would justify.   There is, at the most, only a presumption in favor of this construction of the clause as against the other ; and a presumption may be overbalanced by probabilities not yet considered.   The grammatical argument may, perhaps, be compelled to give way before the force of what we discover on the doctrinal side.   If, for example, it can be shown that St. Paul has distinctly, and perhaps frequently, declared that Christ is not God, we must cease to press this presumption.   Dr. Liddon, in his "Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ," page 314, note, says, "We may be very certain that if ἐπὶ πάντων θεός could prove to be an unwarranted reading, no scholar, however Socinianizing his bias, would hesitate to say that ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς κ. τ. λ. should be referred to the proper name which precedes it."   But Dr. Liddon and all other competent scholars must be aware that the words which he supposes to be omitted, and on the omission of which the statement made by him is founded, are very vital words in the sentence.   They are, it may be, the words which determine the true construction ; so that, while no scholar would hesitate to connect ὁ ὢν with χριστός in case they were not present, every scholar ought not only to hesitate, but also to refuse to make this connection when they are present.   The Apostle's doctrine as to the relation between χριστός and θεός, as we determine it from other passages of his writings, may prove to be such that ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός cannot, by any probability whatever, be regarded as descriptive of χριστός.   We say, may be—for we are assuming that, as yet, we have not ascertained what the Apostle's doctrine on the subject is.   The grammatical presumption, to which we have referred, is not so strong as to be practically decisive of the question.   This we frankly admit, and, in our judgment, it must be admitted.   But such a presumption nevertheless exists, and it deserves notice as showing the probability as to the true construction of the words.   We must, therefore, take our position at this point, at the outset of the discussion, and must allow, as we pursue this first part of the argument, that ὁ ὢν, grammatically considered, is more easily and naturally construed in connection with χριστός, than as the subject of a new and doxological clause.

II.   We turn now to consider, next in order, the phrase τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.   This phrase, by reason of the very limitation which it contains, suggests something of the nature of a contrast.   If Christ did not have some other relation, or stand in some other position besides this one connected with the Jews, and different from it, there would be no

occasion for any such words.   If He were in every sense and respect
"from the Jews," the Apostle would, beyond any reasonable doubt,
have said merely ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός.   There is no instance in the New
Testament where κατὰ σάρκα is used, in which such a contrast is not
plainly intended.   There will, however, as we suppose, be little con-
troversy on this point.   The main question as related to this phrase
in the present verse is, not whether a contrast is intended, but whether
it is expressed.   In regard to this question, extreme positions have
been taken by different writers in opposition to each other, and with
equal confidence on both sides.   The two parties have agreed only in
one particular.   They have both asserted that the answer is determined
decisively by the mere presence of the phrase itself.

On the one hand, it is maintained that the expression τὸ κατὰ
σάρκα requires as an antithesis a reference to Christ's divine nature,
(so *e. g.* Lange), and thus ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ., which are the only words in
the passage that can set forth the antithesis, must necessarily contain
it.   We cannot believe that this assertion, as declaring such a neces-
sity, can be established.   There are several examples of the use of κατὰ
σάρκα without any added expression of this character, in the Pauline
Epistles.   One of these is in the immediate context of this verse;
namely, in Rom. ix. 3, where the Apostle speaks of the Israelites as
his *kinsmen according to the flesh*, and yet says nothing of them in any
other and contrasted relation.   As for τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, no instance of
its use outside of the verse before us occurs either in the writings of St.
Paul, or in any of the other New Testament books.*   But there are
such instances in other Greek writings, where it is plain that there is no
expressed antithesis.   A very noticeable one—noticeable by reason of the
striking similarity of the language to that which the Apostle here em-
ploys—is found in the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, chap.
xxxii.   In speaking of Jacob, Clement says ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς
τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.   Whatever contrast may be implied here, none is set
forth in words by the author.   These examples of the use of κατὰ
σάρκα, either with or without the neuter article, are sufficient to show
that there is no necessity appertaining to the laws of the Greek lan-
guage, and none arising from any inevitable obscurity of thought as
involved in such a phrase without it, for a distinct expression of the
intended antithesis.   Some writers, however, who are not disposed to
go so far as to assert that the phrase *must*, when referring to Christ,
have the contrast *always* supplied in words, affirm that it cannot be
otherwise *here*.   Thus Philippi says, "The suppression of the anti-

---

* The textual reading in Acts ii. 30, which includes these words,
should doubtless be rejected.

thesis, and its supply in thought merely, cannot take place where, as here, the thesis occurs only for the sake of the antithesis. "τὸ κατὰ σάρκα," he adds, "stands merely for the sake of the following ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός. Without this contrast the words would imply a diminution of the prerogative of Israel. The Apostle would then have written simply καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός; for that the Messiah springs from the Jews is a higher privilege than that He springs from them after the flesh merely. But that *He* springs from them after the flesh who is God over all, this is the highest conceivable prerogative." If we were considering probabilities only, this reasoning would have much force. But it must be borne in mind that the words of Philippi include a *cannot*, and claim a *necessity* as existing. That τὸ κατὰ σάρκα is inserted because Christ had another relation, in which he did not belong to the Jewish race, may be admitted. This admission, however, is far from being the same thing as to say, that this relation must be set forth in the words ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός. How do we know that the Apostle did not add the limiting phrase simply because he and his readers appreciated the fact, that the Messiah was not from the Jews in every sense? How do we know that he intended to define particularly what he was in other respects? How do we determine—not that he may, or probably does—but that he *must* give to his sentence this especial emphasis of which Philippi speaks, or that he intends to assign to the Jews "the highest conceivable prerogative?" Those who affirm that the phrase itself renders it absolutely certain that the words ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ. are antithetical to it, are assuming a ground which, as we think, cannot be successfully defended.

In direct opposition to the writers of the class just alluded to, the learned Dutch scholar, van Hengel, in an extended note in his Commentary on this Epistle, endeavors to prove that, according to Greek usage τὸ κατὰ σάρκα here requires a period to be placed after it, and thus the following words must begin a new sentence. His position is that τὸ κατὰ σάρκα must be distinguished from κατὰ σάρκα, and that, when the neuter article is thus used with a restrictive phrase, the appropriate direct contrast is suggested by and involved in this phrase, and any further antithesis is excluded. This position seems to us indefensible, if it amounts to a declaration that a writer, after using τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, cannot state in words what the person to whom he is referring is τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα. Do not the passages cited by Meyer, in his notes on this verse,—namely, Xenophon's Cyr. v. 4, 11, (νῦν τὸ μὲν ἐπ᾽ ἐμοὶ οἴχομαι, τὸ δ᾽ ἐπί σοι σέσωσμαι), Plato, Minos, 320 C., (νομωφύ-λακι γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐχρῆτο ὁ Μίνως κατὰ τὸ ἄστυ, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην

Κρήτην τῷ Τάλῳ), sufficiently prove the opposite? It also seems
indefensible, if it involves the assertion that, though the Apostle might
have expressed the contrast here by a phrase including τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα,
he could not have set it forth without these words, provided that he
desired to use other phraseology giving in substance the same idea.
Language is not bound in cast-iron chains. Certainly the language
of St. Paul is not. But it is not necessary to enter upon a prolonged
discussion respecting this point. If we admit everything which this
distinguished commentator can possibly intend to maintain, the ques-
tion is not settled, as he supposes it to be. There may not be here
any such distinct (τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα) contrast as van Hengel is exclud-
ing. The Apostle may be—not to say, is—stating not what Christ is
on the σάρξ and on the πνεῦμα side, i. e. giving a description of Him
in his two natures or relations, but simply that Christ, who is God
over all, came from the Jews τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. Could he not have said,
Christ, who is the Son of God, or who is the Saviour of the world,
came from the Jews τὸ κατὰ σάρκα? If he had desired to lay an
especial emphasis on the clause beginning with *who is* in this latter
sentence, could he not have placed it after τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, instead of
before these words? If he could, he could do the same thing in the
case before us. This, as we believe, is precisely what he intended to
do. But even the possibility that this view of his purpose is correct
proves that no such argument as that of this Dutch writer is con-
clusive. *

We are thrown back, therefore—on both sides—upon probabilities,
and must pursue our examination accordingly. In order to deter-
mine what these probabilities are, however, we must observe what
the author is attempting to do in the verses to which this passage be-
longs. It is evident that his object is to set forth the privileges and
honors of the Israelitish people, in which he as a Jew might naturally

---

*If the reading of the Textus Receptus in Acts ii. 30 were adopted—
εἰδὼς ὅτι ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ τὸ
κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν χριστόν, καθίσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ—
could not the words τὸν ὄντα ἐπὶ πάντων θεόν have been added to χριστόν
by the author? Would he, because of the presence of τὸ κατὰ σάρκα
have been compelled by the inviolable laws of the Greek language to
omit these words, however greatly he desired to insert them in his sen-
tence? We cannot believe that the language is fettered so closely as
this. But if it is thus limited, so far as the setting forth of a direct con-
trast is concerned, it will not follow that there is a similar limitation
with reference to such a phrase as the one before us, when introduced
for the purpose indicated above.

glory, as an evidence that, in anything which he was about to say respecting them, he was moved by no feeling of hostility.   These honors and privileges he brings before the reader in a series of terms, which are clearly arranged in an order of climax.   At the end of the series is mentioned, as the greatest and highest distinction of his nation, the fact that Christ belonged to them in a certain sense or on a certain side,—τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.   So far there can be no difference of opinion.   The Apostle's position is plain.   But if this be so, is it not antecedently probable, that—in case he could point out, on the πνεῦμα side, some peculiar glory appertaining to Christ, which would serve to show in the most emphatic way what the honor to the Jews of having him appear as one of themselves was—he would for the very purpose of his climax, suggest it to the reader's mind ?   We cannot doubt that an affirmative answer to this question must be given. If, however, the ὁ ὤν clause is referred to Christ, as descriptive of Him, it contains just such a statement of His exalted position as would, in the highest degree, serve this purpose.   It presents the honor divinely bestowed upon the people as nothing else could do; such honor as might well lead the Apostle to the extraordinary expression of devotion to them which we find two verses earlier.   On the other hand, the insertion of an independent sentence ascribing praise to God the Father here, whatever may be said as to the possible fitness of such a sentence in this context, deprives the passage of this emphasis of climax, if we may so speak, which the author appears to be aiming at as one of his main objects.

We are considering the words, it must be remembered, in connection with the rules of language and grammar, at present.   Looking at the sentence in this way, we may say, (a.) τὸ κατὰ σάρκα naturally and necessarily suggests the idea of contrast; (b.) this contrast, though, indeed, it may not always be expressed, will probably be expressed whenever the thought can be brought out more clearly or more impressively by this means; (c.) in the present case, it is evident that the greatest force is given to the words, if the antithesis is distinctly stated; (d.) therefore, in this case, the phrase τὸ κατὰ σάρκα throws the presumption in favor of the view which holds that we have a statement of the antithesis within the sentence; (e.) inasmuch as the clause ὁ ὤν κ. τ. λ. may be interpreted in such a way as to answer the purpose of an antithesis (even expressing it in the manner best adapted to the carrying out of a design which the writer manifestly has in mind), and inasmuch as there is nothing else in the verses which can answer this purpose, the probability is that this clause does express what τὸ κατὰ σάρκα suggests or calls for.

This probability, we readily confess, is not so strong that it might not be over-balanced by the clear teaching of the Apostle, if such could be proved, that Christ is not θεός. Nor is it so strong, that it would be impossible to suppose an *unexpressed* contrast had been in the writer's mind—such, for example, as that, while on the σάρξ side Christ came from the Jews only, on the πνεῦμα side he had relation to Jews and Gentiles alike.* The probability, that is to say, does not reach the limits of certainty. But it is of such strength as to be worthy, as we have already said of that which exists respecting the

---

*That the unexpressed contrast here referred ·to is not the one intended by the Apostle, we think is rendered altogether probable by the following considerations: (*a.*) In the passage of this Epistle in which the πνεῦμα side or relation of Christ is mentioned most distinctly, in contrast with the σάρξ side or relation,—namely, Chap. i., vss. 3, 4, a radically different sense belongs to πνεῦμα. That passage, however, as it appears to us, is one in which the Apostle would have been more inclined, than he would be here, to bring out the relation of the Lord Jesus to all men, in contrast to that in which he stood to the Jews alone. He was there speaking of the Gospel and its proclamation to all the nations. He was intimating that the Old Testament Scriptures had promised and prophesied it ; a point which he subsequently develops as confirming the doctrine of salvation by faith for Jews and Gentiles alike. To refer, under such circumstances, to Christ's relation to both would not have been outside of the line of his thought. But in the verses before us he is confining himself to the Jews only, and is attempting to meet a special difficulty as connected with the covenant of God, which made them earnestly oppose his doctrine. In order to carry out his purpose, he is enumerating their privileges as a nation and the marked evidences of God's favor towards them. It is to them exclusively that his thoughts turn here, though they have turned to others elsewhere. If, in such a context, he says, Christ, who is in himself Divine, is, by his human descent, from the Jews, it is in full harmony with all that he is thus setting forth. But a reference, even by implication, to Christ's spiritual connection with all men, as distinguished from them alone, seems to break in discordantly upon his recital of their peculiar honors, and his defence of himself against their sensitiveness. (*b*). Whatever we may hold with respect to the doctrine of His Deity, we cannot but regard it as evident that, in general, when the πνεῦμα side of Christ is spoken of or hinted at in the New Testament, in distinction from the σάρξ side, the reference is to something internal to himself, or belonging to his relations to God, and not to what is external, appertaining to the connection which he has with all men as opposed to that which he has with the Jewish race.

construction of ὁ ὤν, of very serious consideration.   It passes the *burden of proof* over to the opposite view.

We cannot but regard the probabilities developed thus far in the discussion as cumulative.   If what has been said (in Section I.) of ὁ ὤν is of weight, the probability that the clause beginning with those words stands in a certain contrast to τὸ κατὰ σάρκα is strengthened by this fact.

III.   The next point which demands our attention is the position in the sentence of the word εὐλογητός.   This word occurs just where we should expect to find it, provided the clause is descriptive of Χριστός, but it does not have the place in the order of the sentence which it regularly holds in doxologies.   A new probability in favor of making the clause a descriptive relative one is derived from this fact.

To say, indeed, as many authors have done in the discussion of this verse, that this word, εὐλογητός, cannot possibly stand anywhere in a doxological sentence of this character except at the beginning, is to take an extreme position.   It requires much boldness, as it seems to us, to affirm, in respect to such a matter, what a writer *must* say, or to declare what does not fall within the limits of possibility.   Language rises above rules at times.   In some cases the form of expression may depend, even to the violation of ordinary principles, on the peculiar shade of thought or point of view which characterizes a writer's mind at the moment.   Especially may this be the case where the question is one of emphasis, and where emphasis is connected closely, as it is in the Greek language, with the arrangement of words.

But, setting aside the question of absolute impossibility in any conceivable case, the ordinary rule of the language undoubtedly is, that, in doxologies of an exclamatory character, and of this form, the doxological word has the first place.   This rule is observed by all the writers in the New Testament and Old Testament, and in the O. T. Apocryphal books, who use such sentences at all, and, among others, by St. Paul himself.   This rule seems, also, to be founded in reason, for it is in the very nature of such a sentence to put the exclamation at the beginning.   The fact of the rule, (or custom, if so it be called), and of its reasonableness will scarcely be questioned, and therefore need not be proved.   The only point to be determined is, whether there are exceptions, which show that, after all, the whole matter is dependent on mere chance emphasis in each particular case —so that the doxological word may have any position ; but ordi-

narily has the first simply because, in ordinary cases, the main emphasis rests upon it.

The only exceptional case which is cited from the Scriptures by most writers, is Psalm lxvii. 20, in the Septuagint Version. We are convinced that this passage constitutes no proper exception to the rule, and that it has no bearing upon Rom. ix. 5. We do not say this, indeed, because of the reason which is urged by many ; namely, that the LXX. translators misinterpreted the Hebrew. This we regard as no satisfactory account of the matter. They may have failed to understand the Hebrew, but they were familiar, doubtless, with Greek usage respecting such sentences ; and their arrangement of the words is a thing wholly within the domain of the Greek language. The fact remains that, in a Greek sentence, they have put εὐλογητός in another than the first place.* But when we examine this passage closely, we find that it differs from ordinary doxologies in an important particular. It is a two-fold sentence, having a double or repeated doxology, such as does not occur elsewhere, either in the Old Testament or the New. The verse reads in the LXX., κύριος ὁ θεὸς

---

* The peculiarity of this verse in the Septuagint is supposed by Schultz, who favors the reference of Rom. ix. 5, to Christ, and is admitted by Grimm, who opposes this reference, to be due to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew after the following manner. The Hebrew suggests as the true translation, Thou hast gone up to the high place, thou hast captured a captivity, thou hast taken gifts among mankind and even among rebels,—to dwell as Jah, God. Blessed be the Lord day by day. The LXX. translators, not comprehending the meaning, rendered the words with a slavish literality and adherence to the Hebrew order, καὶ γὰρ ἀπειθοῦντες τοῦ κατασκηνῶσαι κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός—κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν. Being unable, with this reading of the sentence, to connect the phrase κύριος ὁ θεός with what precedes, they concluded that it must be connected with εὐλογητός as a doxology ; and, accordingly, they inserted another εὐλογητός to meet the necessity of a verbal word for the second κύριος. This explanation is, perhaps, the most satisfactory one which can be given. But, if it be adopted, we must notice that it involves the supposition that the LXX. translators, when they failed to understand the verse in the original, considered with some carefulness what they could do with it, and only after such consideration inserted the second doxological word. They, thus, deliberately arranged a Greek sentence in this order ; and, accordingly, we must hold that they felt the order to be not forbidden by the rules of the language. For this reason, as it appears to us, the mere statement that the Seventy misinterpreted the Hebrew is not sufficient to account for their arrangement of the words in this verse of the Psalms.

εὐλογητὸς, εὐλογητὸς κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν.   In double sentences of this kind, there is an altogether peculiar rule of emphasis, which conflicts with, and may overpower, the rule prevailing in single exclamatory clauses.   The rule to which we refer is, that, in such cases, the two parts of the sentence are so arranged that the corresponding or contrasted words are placed either at the end of the first and beginning of the second part ; or at the beginning of the first and end of the second.   The frequency with which this rule is observed by Greek writers will not have escaped the notice of any one who is familiar with their works.   It is observed, as we may not doubt, by the LXX. translators here.   Their desire was to set forth the emphasis on εὐλογητός in this passage in the strongest way.   How could they best accomplish this end ?   How could they, in the twofold sentence with its parallel clauses, give to the doxological words that prominence which in a single exclamatory sentence is secured by placing it at the beginning ?   Evidently, by arranging the clauses precisely as they have done.   For this reason, as we may believe, they adopted this method ; and, in adopting it, they sought to bring out what in single clauses they attained in another way.   If they had translated the Hebrew accurately, with only one doxology, they would, doubtless, have expressed the emphasis as the Hebrew does in this verse, and as they themselves do everywhere else in the Psalms, by placing εὐλογητός at the beginning.   So far, then, from being an exception which proves that the doxological word may stand after the subject of the sentence, as Winer and others maintain, this verse from the Septuagint, in our judgment, strengthens the opposite view, inasmuch as it shows that, even in this peculiar case, this word is made to have the greatest possible prominence. *

* In contrast with those who would make Ps. lxvii. 20, Sept., a case in proof of the application of εὐλογητός in an exclamatory doxology to a subject which precedes it, Lange and Canon Farrar hold that St. Paul, in our present verse, is only echoing the passage from the Psalms and using it to set forth the exaltation of Christ.   They found their opinion on the fact that, in Eph. iv. 8, the Apostle cites a part of the next preceding verse, (Thou hast ascended on high, &c.), in reference to him. " Do we not plainly hear the reëcho of this passage," says Lange, " in the ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων ?   And since we know that Paul applies this passage to the glorification of Christ, is it not clear that he immediately adds that ascription of praise in the Psalm ?   His expression occupies the middle ground between the LXX. and the Hebrew text."   This reasoning seems to be inconclusive.   The apostle, undoubtedly, uses the words of Ps. lxvii. 19, Sept., in the Epistle to the Ephesians, with reference to

One or two passages additional to this one from the Psalms have been cited, for a similar purpose, by individual writers who have discussed the subject. Thus Prof. Grimm, in an article in the *Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie* for 1868–9, refers to the Apoc. Psalms of Solomon, viii. 40, 41, where we find αἰνετὸς κύριος ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν αὐτοῦ ἐν στόματι ὁσίων, καὶ σὺ εὐλογημένος Ἰσραὴλ ὑπὸ κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Gen. xxvii. 29 is mentioned in a note appended to Prof. Andrews Norton's *Statement of Reasons*. Here the words are ὁ καταρώμενός σε ἐπικατάρατος· ὁ δὲ εὐλογῶν σε, εὐλογημένος. It will be observed that, in both of these cases, we have double sentences, and consequently sentences in which we may discover peculiarities as distinguished from simple ones. The former of the two, though not precisely similar to Ps. lxvii. 20, may be explained in the same way. There is, indeed, a kind of chiasmus here. As for the second, the same idea is repeated several times in the Old Testament, *e. g.* Gen. xii. 3, εὐλογήσω τοὺς εὐλογοῦντάς σε, καὶ τοὺς καταρωμένους σε καταράσομαι, Ps. cviii. 28, LXX., καταράσονται αὐτοὶ ·καὶ σὺ εὐλογήσεις, Num., xxiv. 9, οἱ εὐλογοῦντές σε εὐλόγηνται καὶ οἱ καταρώμενοί σε κεκατήρανται. The examination of these verses will show that the writers seem to labor, in all possible ways, to bring out what we may call the compound emphasis. The object, in all this effort, is the same which, in a single clause, is reached in one way only. The compound sentence, therefore, ceases to be a parallel to the simple one. It involves other and peculiar elements, and hence may be subject to special rules appertaining to itself alone.

As a case where, *in a single clause*, the usual order is reversed, Gen. xxvi. 29, has been referred to. The reading here in the common text of the LXX. is καὶ νῦν εὐλογημένος σὺ ὑπὸ κυρίου, but according to some of the manuscripts it is σὺ εὐλογητός. The correct text is so uncertain as to make the evidence to be derived from it somewhat doubtful. But, accepting the reading which places the subject first,

---

Christ. But there we find an evident citation. Here, on the contrary, there is nothing to remind us of the precise words of the Psalm. Can we infer from the fact that in another letter, written four or five years afterwards to another Church, there is an application of a particular Psalm to our Lord, that there is, also, such an application in this letter, when the Psalm itself is not quoted? St. Paul, in addressing the Ephesians, is speaking of another subject, he is presenting the exaltation of Christ with reference to another end, he is employing different expressions, he is calling the attention of his readers directly to the O. T. words. The argument derived from what he says to them can scarcely be of much force as bearing upon his language here.

we think it may be questioned whether the sentence is an exclamatory one, pronouncing Isaac blessed, and is not rather an affirmative one, giving a reason why the speakers had come to him for the purpose of making a covenant. If it is to be interpreted in the latter way, it does not belong in the doxological class.

We will not dwell upon the supposed exceptional cases further. To prove that there is not even a single one within the limits of the Greek language, may be difficult. But certainly the search for them has not been an easy task, and, when the search has seemed to be rewarded by a discovery, the passage which is found has some peculiar characteristics rendering it hardly serviceable for the end in view. We may say, at least, that the cases are so exceedingly rare, that, when we are moving in our argument, as we are now, within the region of probabilities, and not affirming certainties, they afford little strength as opposing the ground which we have taken.

Winer (see his N. T. Grammar, p. 551, Am. ed.) sets aside this whole matter of seeking for exceptional cases or denying their existence. He says, "Only an empirical expositor could regard this position as an unalterable rule ; for when the subject constitutes the principal notion, especially when it is antithetical to another subject, the predicate may and must be placed after it, cf. Ps. lxvii. 20, Sept. And so in Rom. ix. 5, if the words, ὁ ὤν, &c., are referred to God, the position of the words is quite appropriate, and even indispensable." Other writers have maintained substantially the same ground. It will be convenient, in continuing our discussion, to make these remarks of Winer the starting point for a few suggestions.

(*a.*) We may admit that the rule of arrangement is that of emphasis. But the question before us is, in fact, this: Whether in such doxological passages, having an exclamatory character, the doxological word is not necessarily the emphatic one. The decision of this question may not, indeed, be reached by the mere empirical expositor. But, if not, is he not, after all, working along a line of examination which ought to be followed? Is not the determination of universal usage a most important, not to say the conclusive, thing? If all writers pursue the same course, does not their unanimous action carry with it the greatest weight, and show that there must be some ground in the nature of things for their unanimity?

(*b.*) But, passing this point, let us look at Winer's more particular positions. These are that the doxological word *may*, and that it even *must*, stand after the subject, provided the subject constitutes the principal notion, and especially when it is antithetical to another subject. That the word *must*, in this statement, cannot be sustained, is, we

think, proved by such instances as LXX. Gen. xiv. 19, 20, 1 Kings xxv. 32, 33, where we have contrasted subjects, and, in the latter case, the σύ (vs. 33.) is the "principal notion" because of the clause ή ἀποκωλύσασα, etc., which contains the very ground and substance of the whole exclamation. As for the word *may*, on the other hand, it is, to say the least, not justified by Winer's cited example, Ps. lxvii. 20; for, whatever else may be said of the passage, it presents no such peculiar prominence of the subject. There seems to be no evidence of any prominence at all in the subject, except the mere fact of the arrangement of the words. But to assume that this fact proves it, is, in the first place, to assume the very point in dispute, and in the second place, to assume that no other reason can be given for the peculiar order.

(*c.*) Without, however, pressing this question of *may* and *must*, we ask what is the prominence of the subject in Rom. ix. 5, which renders it in such a degree the principal notion, that its position before the doxological word is not only "quite appropriate," as Winer maintains, but "even indispensable?" It must be, if we are guided by his paragraph quoted above, either (*x.*) because of a contrast with something else in the passage,—which, it would seem, is either Christ or the Israelites, or *(y.)* because God is designated as the author of the blessings and privileges mentioned in this verse and the preceding one, and that this authorship is the principal thought or notion. With reference to *x.* we should say that there is no such contrast here, and that, if there were, there are passages of sufficient number in the Old Testament, in which, while the contrast is much more marked and striking, the doxological word keeps its regular position at the beginning of the clause, to show that the Biblical writers did not reverse the order in such cases, or regard the fact of a contrast as having any influence towards a reversal. Compare, for example, LXX. Gen. xiv. 19, 20, 1 Kings xxv. 32, 33, already referred to ; and, as furnishing quite as much of contrast as can possibly be found in Rom. ix. 5, LXX. Ps. lxxxviiii; 53, whether we consider the contrast as with the enemies or the anointed, τοῦ χριστοῦ σου, (Ps.) the Israelites or Christ, (Rom.). In respect to *y.*, we should maintain that there are passages in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, where the subject is clearly and emphatically the principal notion—as much so as it is in our present verse—in which the writer, nevertheless, places it after the doxological word. Compare 2 Macc. xv. 34, as a marked instance. In this verse, as we see in view of the context, the chief idea, and the point and force of the offering of praise to God, are found in the words ὁ διατηρήσας τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον ἀμίαντον, as they

are in ὁ ὤν, etc., according to Winer's statement, in Rom. ix. 5.   It
is *the great act*, there as much as here, and so, we think, in LXX.
1 Kings xxv. 33, and elsewhere, which calls forth the doxology, and
yet no change in the order is made.*

(*d.*) If it be said that these cases, and others which might be men-
tioned, do not correspond with the one now under discussion, because
the name of the subject is here *preceded* by a descriptive clause, ὁ ὤν, etc.,
which marks the subject as the principal notion, it must be admitted
that there is no passage in the Septugaint precisely corresponding, in
this respect, with the present one.   Can we believe, however, that,
if in Ps. lxxi. 18, Sept. for example, which now reads εὐλογητὸς κύριος
ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ὁ ποιῶν θαυμάσια μόνος, the writer had wished to
use only the phrase ὁ ποιῶν θαυμάσια θεός, instead of the words which
he does use, he would have been compelled, or, so far as we can
judge, would have been disposed, to place εὐλογητός after it ?   Or,
again, would it have been necessary to vary, in this respect, the order
of the sentence in Ps. cxvii. 26 Sept., if to the clause, as it now reads,
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου the writer had desired to
add words such as χριστὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας?   It is true that the dox-
ologies in the Septuagint which introduce the word εὐλογητός have, in
all cases, the name of the subject immediately following this word,
and, if a descriptive or causal clause occurs, it is added with ὅτι or ὅς
and a verb, or with ὁ and a participle.   But this fact seems to point,
not so much to an impossibility of placing such a descriptive phrase,
consisting of ὁ and a participle, before the name of the subject in
such a sentence, but rather to the probability that, if St. Paul had
wished to insert a doxology here, he would have adopted the course
of the LXX. translators, and would have written εὐλογητός first, θεός
in the second place, and then a participial clause with ὁ, or a verbal
one with ὅς or ὅτι.   The argument, thus, is rather unfavorable than
favorable to the supposition that the Apostle's words are designed to
be an ascription of praise to God the Father.

----

* As the doxological clause in 2 Macc. xv. 34 follows the verb εὐλόγησαν
(οἱ δὲ πάντες εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησαν τὸν ἐπιφανῆ κύριον, λέγοντες),
it may, perhaps, be claimed that this verb requires the emphasis in the
doxology to be on εὐλογητός.   If we admit this—which may be regarded
as doubtful, to say the least,—we may, nevertheless, confidently affirm,
from the unvarying usage of the Septuagint, that the same arrange-
ment of words would have been given, if the verb in question had not
been in the text ; and the passage remains, therefore, as a suitable one
for the purpose for which it is here used.

(*e.*) But if Rom. ix. 5, is a passage in which the writer desired to set forth a peculiar emphasis in relation to the subject, such as surpasses that which was aimed at in any doxological verse of the Old Testament; if this emphasis was to be connected with God's authorship of the blessings which had been given to Israel; and if the end was sought by placing the descriptive clause not merely before the name of the subject, but also before the doxological word; we cannot but think that he would have written, not what we have before us, but τῷ δὲ ὄντι ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, (or, with another order, τῷ δὲ θεῷ τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων ὄντι δόξα, etc.). He would have adopted this course, we think, for two reasons: *first*, because the almost or quite universal usage in such exclamatory doxologies, (as we see in all the Scriptural writers), would have led him to apprehend a possible misunderstanding of the clause, if put in its present form,—we say this, of course, on the verbal and grammatical side, not on the doctrinal, —and *secondly*, because the form of expression with the dative was well known to him and frequently used in his epistles, and, indeed, the most common form at the end of his paragraphs, while at the same time it would, if employed, be unmistakable in its meaning.

(*f.*) Before closing our remarks on this part of the subject, we would call attention to one further point. Meyer and some others maintain that the doxological passages in the LXX. which have the copula are, in no essential point, different from those which have not, so far forth as the matter now in hand is concerned. Hence they claim that all passages of this class, in which the subject precedes εὐλογημένος, are pertinent as bearing upon our present verse. The εἴη or γένοιτο or ἔστω in such sentences, it is affirmed, has no emphasis, and the position of the other words is determined by the fact that the stress falls rather upon the subject than the predicate. The passages of this character are the following: Ruth ii. 19, 2 Chron. ix. 8, Job i. 21, Ps. lxxi. 17, Ps. cxii. 2, Dan. ii. 20. A careful examination of these verses, in connection and comparison with others in which εὐλογητός or εὐλογημένος occurs without the copula, will show, we are confident, that there is no evidence that the subject has any more prominence in the one case than in the other. Compare LXX. Ps. lxxi, 17, for example, where we have ἔστω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ εὐλογημένον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, with the same Psalm, verse 19, where the words are εὐλογητὸν τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. It is worthy of notice that, in all these cases, the Hebrew reads the verb, the subject and the doxological word in the same order,* while in the passages of the other class the doxological word

---

* In Ps. lxxii. (LXX. lxxi.) 17, the Hebrew omits the word *blessed:* " Let his name be for ever."

is always placed first. Is not the true explanation of the matter the following: namely, that the LXX. translators strictly rendered the Hebrew in both classes of sentences, and that both the Hebrew and Septuagint writers obeyed a natural law of language; the law that, in exclamatory doxologies of this character, the doxological word holds the first position, but, where a copula is introduced, the doxological word may follow the subject—even as we say, in English, Happy is the man, but, Let the man be happy, although the subject is no more prominent, or the principal notion, in the one case than in the other.

We may remark here again, that the argument seems to be cumulative. The probability arising from the position of εὐλογητός, strong in itself, is strengthened still further by its connection with ὁ ὤν,—by the naturalness, that is, with which it is taken as a predicate after ὤν;—and especially in view of the fact that in the other two instances in which we have similar expressions in the Pauline Epistles, (Rom. i. 25, and 2 Cor. xi. 31), it is a predicate; in the former after ὅς ἐστιν, in the latter after ὁ ὤν.

IV.   The phrase ὁ ὤν ἐπὶ πάντων is, we think, more readily referred to Christ, in this connection, than to God, because, as descriptive of the exaltation and glory of Christ, ἐπὶ πάντων is a very natural and suitable phrase, (as e. g. in Eph. iv. 6, with reference to the Father), but, as setting forth the fact that God's superintending providence had allotted to the Israelites such blessings, it seems clear that some other expression would have been better adapted to convey the thought. Some other expression would, therefore, probably have been employed. That ἐπὶ πάντων *cannot* be used as relating to God in view of the thought of this context, we would not affirm, as some have been disposed to do. But the balance of probability is in favor of the other reference.

It has been asserted, indeed, that ὤν would have been omitted, if the Apostle had intended to speak of God. · We doubt the propriety of this assertion. ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός and ὁ ὤν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός are phrases which do not, or at least may not, have precisely the same meaning. St. Paul here, according to the rendering of the sentence which is proposed for the marginal note by the American Revisers, says, "he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever." For this expression the language used is perfectly fitted, and more so than ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός would be. We think it may be said in this connection, however, that there is a somewhat greater naturalness in the use of the words ὁ ὤν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, as compared with ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, or even ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων ὤν θεός, if the reference be to Christ.

Many writers have further claimed, that, if the clause were designed
to be a doxology, a particle like δέ would be inserted at the begin-
ning, so that it would read ὁ δὲ ὤν, etc.   No doubt this is the com-
mon construction in such cases, and therefore there is a certain de-
gree of probability, by reason of this fact, against the doxological
interpretation here.   But it must be remembered that St. Paul is a
writer whose style is marked often by abrupt transitions.   In the sen-
tences of such a writer, particles of this sort may easily be omitted.
The ardor of his feeling is manifested, at times, by the abruptness,
and the emphasis is made stronger.   A clear case of the omission of
δέ under such circumstances may be found in 2 Cor. ix. 15, if we
adopt the reading favored by the oldest manuscripts and approved by
the best textual scholars.

In regard to the phrase now under consideration we may say that,
at each point to which we have referred, there is a slight balance, at
least, in favor of uniting it with χριστός.   There is no difficulty as
appertaining to the language used, if the words are taken as descrip-
tive of Christ.   The absence of δέ, the position of ὤν, and the ἐπὶ
πάντων constitute reasons of some, even if it be but little, weight,
as bearing against the independence of the clause and its separation
from the preceding words.

We have, thus, examined the several parts of the passage which
have any important bearing upon the decision as to its meaning: ὁ ὤν
—ἐπὶ πάντων—εὐλογητός—τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.   They, each and all, afford
a probability that the clause relates to Christ.   They point in one
direction; and this wholly apart from doctrinal considerations,—in the
region of language and grammar alone.   We cannot say, indeed, that
any one of these phrases presents an absolutely conclusive argument
on this side of the question.   Nor can we maintain, since a chain is
no stronger than its links, that all the phrases, when taken together,
constitute such an argument, or determine the reference to God to be
impossible.   At the same time, there is, if we may so express it, *a
combined and compounded probability*, the force of which cannot easily
be shaken, as it seems to us, and should not fail to be duly con-
sidered.

V.   Beyond the words of the individual clause, their meaning and
connection, there is one further point which deserves particular notice.
The relation of the clause to the entire context may have an impor-
tant influence in determining the intention of the author when he
wrote it.   In which direction does the context turn the balance of

probability ? We think, towards the same reference, to which, as we
have already seen, the words direct us.   The antecedent presumption
from the surrounding verses is against a doxology to God in this place.
Some have held that this presumption amounts to certainty.   The
introduction of such a doxology here, they assert, would be so un-
suitable as to render it quite impossible to suppose that the Apostle
could have thought of it for a moment.   To us, however, this view
appears to be quite without foundation.   Indeed, we cannot regard
an ascription of praise to God as *especially* out of place at this point.
St. Paul had been enumerating the peculiar blessings and honors of
his own people, which had given them, as he rejoiced to feel, an exalted
position in the world.   He was declaring his affection for them, and
the absence of all enmity even when compelled to say what might seem
harsh and offensive.   He was testifying to his sorrow for evil which
befell them, and his joy and pride in all their history as evidencing God's
favor.   These are the thoughts of the first five verses of this chapter.
Why could he not, and why should he not, at the close of these
verses, and after the enumeration of these blessings, break forth into
the exclamation,   "May he who is over all, God, be blessed for
ever!" But, while we admit this, we must observe that the pro-
gress of the author's thought is towards the sixth verse and what
follows it, and that the balance of probability cannot be determined
without considering the five verses in connection with the sixth and
the rest of the chapter.   As we look at the matter from this point of
view, we find that the thought moves on in an easy and natural way,
if we make the reference of these words, which are under discus-
sion, to be to Christ.   As I come now, (the Apostle says in sub-
stance), after my preceding argument and discourse to speak of
the lapse of the Jews, I assure them that I do it with sorrow,
not with willingness ; for how could I do it willingly, since they
are my own countrymen, and are the people who have been hon-
ored by the possession of the law, etc., and by the fact that the
Divine Christ entered into our world as one of their race;—and I
assure them also (vs. 6), that, in saying what I am compelled to say,
I do not mean that the covenant of God, which has given them all
these blessings, has failed or will fail.   I only say, that it has been
misapprehended in its true meaning and application by my country-
men.   Understood in this way, everything becomes clear ; the em-
phasis throughout is just what we should anticipate; the relation of
the introductory verses to the main portion of the chapter is most ap-
propriate and most simple.   If, on the other hand, we have a dox-
ology at the end of the fifth verse, there is a certain arresting of the

thought and drawing aside of the mind, which, in a measure, breaks the closeness of the connection.   Now, as the chapter is not written for the sake of the introduction, but the introduction for the sake of the chapter, it would seem that we ought to explain these verses, in every part of them, in the way which will place them most in harmony with what follows.

VI.   If the considerations thus far presented are of weight, and the argument is, in some degree, cumulative as it proceeds, we may properly notice the fact before closing, that the writers of the Primitive Church, so far as they refer to this passage, seem almost uniformly to give the interpretation which applies the words to Christ.   The value of patristic interpretation may be questioned, indeed, and in the case of some of the fathers it is possible that reasons may be suggested which influenced their minds, apart from the mere language which is used by the Apostle.   But, whatever may be said in this way, and however we may estimate these writers, their substantial or complete unanimity is a circumstance which should not be disregarded.   We do not insist on this point with urgency, because we cannot look upon it as having so much importance as it has appeared to many to have.   As connected with and following upon what has been previously presented, however, we give the fact a place in the argument which we think it deserves.

We thus bring our presentation of the subject, so far as this side of the argument is concerned, to a close.   There are considerations upon the other side, which demand notice, if our discussion is to be complete, or if it is to be carried forward with impartiality.   To these we now turn our attention.

I.   Looking simply at the matter of language—and apart from all doctrinal controversy—we see, it is said, that St. Paul does not use the word $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, in any single instance unless it be here, with reference to Christ.   This word is found in the Pauline Epistles about five hundred and fifty times.   If among all these cases no one is discovered in which Christ is called $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, outside of the verse before us, what is the inference as to this verse?   Is it not, manifestly, that he is not so called here?   The advocates of the interpretation which makes the clause a doxology to God press this question with much emphasis and confidence.   They claim that the presumption in favor of their view, and against the application of the words to Christ, becomes at this point overwhelming; that it overbalances, indeed, everything which has been or can be urged upon the other side.

Estimate this presumption, however, as fairly as we may, it must be admitted, we think, as has been already said with respect to some of those mentioned upon the other side, that it does not amount to certainty. Certainty, in this connection, could come only from a positive statement on the part of the Apostle, or, at least, of some writer in the New Testament, that Christ is not θεός. But no such statement exists. It must also be admitted, we think, that, in and of itself, it does not reach the highest limits of probability, for if in our study of his writings we find, perchance, indications that divine attributes are ascribed by St. Paul to Christ, this fact may open the way for our believing that he somewhere calls him God. Or if the sentence before us, on investigation, proves to present some difficulties in the meaning of words or in construction, which are equally great with any involved in supposing that the Apostle here deviates from his uniform custom elsewhere, we must weigh these difficulties in the balance with this presumption, in order to our reaching our final result.

So much may be said, even if there are no instances of this use of θεός to be discovered. But in case our examination leads to the finding of a few such instances, the argument now before us will, evidently, lose much, if not all, of its force. The presumption will sink into a far lower region of probability. This will be so, because the present sentence if interpreted of Christ will, under these circumstances, be no longer distinguished from every other Pauline sentence. It will be so, also, because, as it is antecedently to be expected that the word θεός will generally be applied to God the Father, even a small number of examples of reference to Christ may justify us in assuming such a reference, wherever the indications of the sentence itself point in that direction. We are brought, therefore, to the inquiry whether any such cases, which are in point, actually exist, or whether any considerations may properly be offered which tend to weaken or set aside the argument now before us.

The full and satisfactory examination in regard to the use of the word θεός would involve a discussion of all the verses, in which it has been maintained that St. Paul applies it to Christ. Such a discussion, however, would reach far beyond the limits of this paper. We can only indicate, as briefly as possible, a few points which may have a bearing upon the true view of the subject, and may help towards showing precisely what the strength or weaknesss of the presumption asserted to exist here is. These points are the following:

(*a.*) In Acts xx. 28, the textual evidence is so strong in favor of θεοῦ that it is accepted as the true reading by prominent scholars, and

among them by Westcott and Hort, in their recently published edition of the Greek Testament. The English Revisers have retained the word *God* in their text. It must be admitted by all, that this may have been the original word, and that the other reading, κυρίου, cannot be considered as certainly to be substituted. The question, to say the most we can for that other reading, is nearly evenly balanced. Here, then, is one instance where we find a not improbable justification for explaining our present passage as having reference to Christ.

(*b.*) In Titus ii. 13, the arguments which are connected with the natural construction of the verse, favor the reference of θεοῦ to Christ. The ordinary grammatical rule, according to which two appellative words connected by καί under a common article belong to the same substantive, points to this application of the word. That this rule is universal, is denied. That it holds with regard to the verse in question, is not admitted by Winer and some others. The suggestions of Winer, however, in support of his view do not seem to be conclusive, when they are examined, and we are persuaded that the grounds for applying the rule in this verse have not been duly considered by most of those who have written upon the subject. The English Revisers, here also, have given in their text the rendering which assigns the name *God* to Christ.

(*c.*) The other verses from the Pauline Epistles which have been cited for the purpose of showing that this name is thus given, such as Col. ii. 2, Eph. v. 5, 2 Thess. i. 12, Tit. i. 3, we regard as having, according to the probabilities of the case, another interpretation. We, therefore, mention them only that it may not be supposed they have been overlooked, but do not rest the argument, in any measure, upon them. The first two of them, not to say all, may possibly be instances in point, but the possibility does not seem to reach the limits of probability. I Tim. iii. 16, can hardly be cited at all, since the true text is ὅς, not θεός, as the best critics now generally admit.

(*d.*) Whatever may be the final decision with regard to any or all of these passages, St. Paul unquestionably uses very strong expressions respecting Christ, which bear Him to an exaltation closely approaching to that which would be indicated by giving Him the name θεός, if, indeed, they do not fully reach it;—especially in Phil. ii. 6–8 and Col. ii. 9. He who "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God," and in whom "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," would seem to be worthy of the loftiest title. He has θεότης abiding in him; may he not somewhere be called θεός?

(*e.*) The Apostle John uses the word θεός of Christ in his Gospel, i. 1, xx. 28. If this be admitted, we must allow that the thought of

Christ as God was not foreign to the apostolic mind, and therefore, that it may not have been strange to Paul. We may notice, also, that St. John, though using this word about one hundred and fifty times, applies it to Christ only twice, or, if xx. 28, is excluded, only once. We find, thus, a fact in connection with his writings, which corresponds, in its measure, with what we see in St. Paul's Epistles, if Rom. ix. 5 is the only instance of his employing θεός in this way.

(f.) This brings us to what we regard as an important suggestion, as relating to the matter now before us. If St. Paul and the other Apostles believed that the word θεός was properly applicable to Christ, it is, nevertheless, not strange that they should have spoken of him scores or hundreds of times as man, or as Messiah, while referring to him only in occasional instances as God. It was to be expected, on the other hand, that this would be their course. Their work, to which they devoted their energy and life, was, as we must remember, to persuade their fellow men to accept as a Savior the *man* who had taught them, whose disciples they had been during His earthly ministry, and whom they had seen after His resurrection and as he ascended towards heaven. The question whether he was God or not, however important in itself, was, in this view, a secondary and subordinate one. Those writers who have asserted that, if the New Testament authors had accepted the doctrine of Christ's Divinity, they would have declared it on every page, misapprehend, as it appears to us, the position of these authors and the first and main object which they had in view. As they besought those to whom they preached the Gospel to be reconciled to God, they set before them the Mediator through whom the reconciliation was made possible. They naturally described him in this official and intermediate relation, as he appeared on earth. They wrote about him as they preached, mainly in his distinction from God and in his human manifestation, and only in a far less degree did they feel impelled to discourse of his union in being with God, or to give him the name of God. It was Jesus, whom they preached. If men would come in faith to Jesus, they believed that they would gradually, if not at once, reach the apprehension that he was Divine. They called him, therefore, Jesus, Christ, Saviour, Mediator, Man, often and always. They called him God only here and there,—only, it may be, at very rare intervals.

The argument now under consideration is, in our judgment, the strongest one which can be brought forward against the reference of the clause before us to Christ. To those who present it, it appears conclusive. But, even if we admit that none of the passages cited from the Pauline writings prove that θεός is used of him, the points

to which we have called attention are, as it appears to us, of much importance.   They show that, at the most, very few instances of such use are to be looked for, under any circumstances.   They show, also, that St. Paul does not hesitate to employ expressions, which are little short of what this verse would mean, if interpreted as declaring that Christ is God.   And, further, they show that one of the other Apostles makes this declaration, with the use of this word, only in one or two places, though he applies the word to God the Father as many times as Paul does in proportion to the extent of his writings.   When we bear all this in mind, and remember that the naturalness of the construction in every part of the sentence points to the reference to Christ, the deviation from the Apostle's usual or uniform custom ceases to be so strange as it has been judged to be.   Few passages in his Epistles, we must remember also, give a more fitting occasion than this for setting forth this exaltation.

II.   It is urged as bearing against the reference of the words under discussion to Christ, that doxologies ascribing praise to him are not found in the Apostolic writings.   On this point it may be said, (a.) that Rev. i, 6, v. 13, 2 Pet. iii. 18, are clear instances of doxologies to Christ.   2 Tim. iv. 18, is, also, another instance according to the view of commentators in general.   Unless all these cases are set aside by denying the apostolic authorship of the books, the argument must be regarded as having no foundation.   (b.) 1. Pet. iv. 11, and Heb. xiii. 21, are passages in which such doxologies may possibly be found. If so,—the former is from a book whose author was, in all probability, an apostle.   We do not, however, press these cases in the discussion, for we consider them as referring, most probably, not to Christ, but to God the Father.   (c) But, whatever may be the result of our search for examples, it is clear that the Apostles speak in the most exalted language of Christ.   St. Paul himself unites him with God the Father, in the Apostolic Benediction.   He calls him the Lord of glory; the image of God; the Lord from heaven; the Lord of the living and the dead; God's own Son.   He represents him as before all things; as the one through whom are all things; as sustaining all things; as having a name that is above every name; as the one to whom all things in heaven and earth and under the earth are to bow.   He declares that he was in the form of God; that he is now at the right hand of God; that in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge; and that he is raised far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come.   That one who

says all this should somewhere pass the limits of ordinary language, and even call him *God*, would hardly surprise us.   It would seem to be no more than a fit description of his glory.   But much more may we regard it as quite consistent for such a writer, in a passage like Rom. ix. 5, to use a word ascribing to him *praise and blessing*, even if no instance can be found where a *formal doxology* occurs.   There are not more than ten such doxologies, it may be noticed, in all the Pauline Epistles.   There are only two, (2 Cor. i. 3, Eph. i. 3.) where this word εὐλογητός is used.

III.   But not merely is the doxological character of the sentence made a ground of rejecting the appplication of it to Christ.   The word εὐλογητός itself is not used anywhere in the New Testament as relating to him; and this circumstance is adduced to show the improbability that he is referred to here.   The facts with regard to this matter are these.   There are but seven instances of the use of this word, outside of the present verse, in the entire New Testament. There are but four in St. Paul's Epistles.   The kindred word εὐλογη-μένος, occurs in only eleven cases, and six or seven of these are mere repetitions of a single quotation from the Psalms.   In this repeated cita-tion and in one other passage, εὐλογημένος, which is elsewhere used of human beings, is applied to Christ.   In Mark xiv. 61, on the other hand, Christ is called " the Son of the Blessed;" ὁ εὐλογητός being employed as a designation of God.   With respect to these facts we may remark, (a.) that the number of examples of the use of εὐλογητός seems insufficient to determine usage as invariable,—to the exclusion of even an individual case; (b.) that the application of εὐλογημένος, (as distinguished from εὐλογητός), to Christ in six repetitions of an Old Testament verse can scarcely prove that a writer could not make use of the other word in a seventh instance, if he should desire to do so; (c.) that the two words are found in the Old Testament referring both to God and men, with a somewhat greater freedom than we discover in the very few passages occurring in the New Testament; (d.) that, in the case cited from Mark's Gospel, the language is that of the Jewish High Priest who was evidently referring to the declarations of Jesus, that He was the Son of God; and that we cannot fairly con-clude from this phrase as thus employed, that, to the Apostolic mind, εὐλογητός was an inappropriate word to apply to Christ; (e.) and, finally, that,—considering the very limited amount of evidence which can be brought forward respecting this word, as found in the New Testament books,—the fact that in the only two places similar to the one now under consideration, in which St. Paul uses the word,

(namely Rom. i. 25 and 2 Cor. xi. 31), it is a predicate descriptive of the subject, is deserving of special notice.

IV.   The distinction made between God and Christ in 1 Cor. viii. 6. and Eph. iv. 5, 6, is urged as inconsistent with the interpretation of the clause before us as referring to Christ.   Undoubtedly, a distinction is set forth in those verses.   But it does not seem to follow from this fact, necessarily, that a similar distinction must be made here.   If we suppose Christ to be θεός, it cannot be regarded as impossible, or even improbable, that an Apostle should desire at one time to speak of God and Christ in their separate positions and relations, and at another should wish to describe Christ in himself alone. Nor is it unreasonable to suppose, that, in the former case, he should represent Christ as κύριος, and God the Father as θεός, adding ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν, as Paul does in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and that, in the latter, he should say of Christ ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, as in Rom. ix. 5.   That the verses cited have no bearing on the question, we would not affirm.   They suggest a certain degree of probability, that the present verse ought to be interpreted as they must be.   But we cannot regard them as having any considerable weight, because, on the supposition just made, it becomes so easy to explain the different cases on different grounds, and, thus, to show that they may have no complete parallelism.

The points which we have presented on this side of the question, like those on the other side which were previously stated, are in the region of language and its use by the Apostle, and not in that of doctrine.   We legitimately investigate the writings of an author and try to determine what his usage is, if we are in doubt respecting the significance or the application of words in a particular passage.   So we ordinarily do in the case of a classical Greek writer.   So we may, with equal propriety, do when interpreting St. Paul's Epistles.   If we find, on such investigation, that he never uses θεός elsewhere as applied to Christ; that he never employs the word εὐλογητός when speaking of him; that doxologies to Christ are not discoverable in his writings; and that, in certain noticeable passages where a distinction is made between him and the Father, the Father only is called ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων ; it will scarcely be denied that all these things, when taken together, present a strong probability that a passage which involves these several words and expressions is not a description of Christ, but a doxology to God the Father.   We have seen, however, as we think, that, with regard to the last three of these points, the impression

which the first statement of them may make upon the mind, is diminished in its force, not to say entirely removed, when we come to consider them more carefully. We may argue usage from five hundred examples with some reason, but from four cases in which Paul has εὐλογητός, or ten doxologies all referring to God, we cannot infer a rule of language, from which he could nowhere deviate for what seemed to him sufficient grounds. He certainly sets forth Christ as worthy of glory and honor, if he does not put his words in the form of an ordinary doxology. He does put them in this form, if the passage in the Second Epistle to Timothy, already cited, is allowed as referring to Christ and as written by the Apostle. Moreover, the distinction made between Christ and God in a few passages does not force us to the conclusion that there may not be a union between them, so that, when the former point is before the mind, one Lord and one God are mentioned apart, but, when the other thought is prominent, the one Lord receives the Divine name, which belongs to him as Divine.

We are left, therefore, for the main support of the position assumed upon this side of the question in dispute, to the first of the four arguments presented,—namely, that with reference to the word θεός. The force of this argument, we think we may justly say, is very greatly weakened by the suggestions which have been already made respecting it. We are not disposed to deny, however, that it is deserving of careful consideration on the part of all who, in their study of the passage, honestly seek for the truth.

It will be noticed as a somewhat singular fact, as we review these several grounds which are rested upon by the advocates of the reference of the words to God the Father, that they are all connected with and derived from the general usage of the Apostle. They are, thus, brought to bear upon the meaning of the passage from sources which are outside of it. The grounds, on the other hand, which those allege who would make the sentence descriptive of Christ, fall within the limits of the construction of the passage itself. Arguments of both sorts are legitimate, and may be of great value and great strength. But in general, as we think, those which belong to the words themselves, as they stand before us, will carry with them the greater weight, because a writer may turn aside from his ordinary usage, or even start a new one, in some particular sentence. What a writer's usage is, we determine only by the observation of a certain number of known cases. Whether in a new and hitherto unobserved case he accords with what we have found elsewhere, depends on the possibilities or the probabilities of the phenomena presented by

it (that is, its own words and the rules of construction), and on the reasons which may have easily influenced him at the time of writing.

In the present case, all the arguments which are founded upon the probabilities of construction, and of the meaning of individual words, point towards interpreting the sentence as referring to Christ. These arguments, also, grow in strength as we pass from one to another, for each new one seems to gain something from its connection with those which precede it. Combined in their force, they press us to the conclusion that this is the correct interpretation. We find them opposed by only one, which stands the test of examination. This one, like all which are brought forward in union with it, is derived from the alleged unvarying custom of the Apostle elsewhere, to use a particular word or phrase in a particular way. But, considering all that has been said respecting this word, as connected with the exalted idea of Christ which the Apostle sets forth in language bearing the highest meaning, this argument does not seem to meet the full force of those which it opposes. It leaves the mind of the student or reader, therefore, to follow the pathway to which they point, and, thus, to interpret as the English text reads: "of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever."

At the same time, so long as this argument from usage retains any considerable measure of its weight, the candid scholar must feel, we think, that a marginal rendering ought to be given. The English reader should, by this means, be put in possession of the knowledge of the fact, that the Greek words may possibly have another meaning —that they *may* refer not to Christ, but to the Father. The Revisers on both sides of the ocean have only been faithful to the demands laid upon them, as they have introduced such a marginal rendering into their amended version. It is idle to say, as a distinguished English writer and bishop has recently done, that the translation which makes these words a doxology to God the Father is "a mere evasion of acute minds, occupied by dogmatic prepossessions against the Divinity of Jesus." The discussion of the subject in this paper has been wholly in the field of language and grammar. It has occupied itself with the meaning of words, the construction of sentences, and the usage of the writer; and with these things only. But it has shown that there is an uncertainty in the very form of expression which the Apostle here uses, and that the clause allows two different explanations. It has shown, also, that these have just grounds on which to claim attention.

The question ceases to be one of certainties, and becomes one of probabilities. The probabilities turn towards the reference to Christ, indeed, if our argument has been correct, but not so completely and overwhelmingly as to make it right to ignore the other view altogether. In their Preface to the Revised Version the Revisers say, "We have placed before the reader in the margin other renderings than those which were adopted in the text, wherever such renderings seemed to deserve consideration." The rule for their action was the only proper one for them to adopt. Their insertion of a marginal note at this verse was in accordance with a proper application of the rule.

If, now, we regard it as established that the text of the Revised Version gives that interpretation of the passage which, by its greater probability, deserves to be preferred, and yet that some form of words setting forth the other meaning should be added in the margin, the question arises as to what this form should be. Should it be that which the American Revision Company have suggested, or one, or indeed all, of those presented by the English Company? A few words in answer to this inquiry seem to be required.

There are two points here, which deserve to be noticed. The first has reference to the words which introduce the marginal rendering. The English Revisers have deviated here from their universal custom elsewhere, and have attributed the translations which they record in their margin to "some modern interpreters." This appears to us improper for two reasons: (a.) because the ground on which the rendering of the text throughout the New Testament is preferred, or that on which a marginal interpretation is added, is not that ancient writers have favored it, but that fidelity to truth demands it; and (b.) because the insertion of these words *in this place alone* is calculated to give the ordinary reader an impression that the early fathers were better interpreters than modern scholars, which is not in accordance with the facts of the case. If this verse calls for an alternate rendering at all, it calls for it on similar grounds to those which occasion other alternate renderings, and it ought to be introduced, as all others are, by *Or.* The American suggestion, so far as this point is concerned, is surely the proper and right one.

The second point has reference to the different modes of translating, if we refer the clause to God. The English present three modes, two which place a period after *flesh;* and one which puts a comma after *flesh*, and a period after *all.* The renderings, then, are, as mentioned at the beginning of this paper:

(*a.*) Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh.   He who is God over all be (is) blessed for ever.

(*b.*) Of whom, &c.   He who is over all is God blessed for ever.

(*c.*) Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all. God be (is) blessed for ever.

The American body propose to substitute for all these a fourth form :

(*d.*) Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh : he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever.

Of these four forms which one deserves to be preferred? The fourth, as it seems to us.   Let us compare it with each of the others; and, in the first place, with (*c.*).   It must be admitted that (*c.*) has two advantages, as contrasted with (*d.*)—namely, it allows the natural and easy connection of ὁ ὤν with χριστός, and it affords a contrast to τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.   But, on the other hand, with this punctuation of the sentence, (1.) the doxology becomes much more abrupt ; (2.) it loses all presentation of the ground for its introduction ; (3.) it seems to be even less in the line of the Apostle's thought, than if (*d.*) be adopted ; (4.) it furnishes no account of the position of εὐλογητός, after the subject ; and (5.) it involves a difficulty of some moment in the absence of the article with θεός.   For these reasons we think it must be rejected, as being less probably than (*d.*) the true construction, in case the word θεός refers to God the Father.

As compared with (*b.*), it appears to us that (*d.*) is decidedly to be preferred.   (*b.*) is rather a formal statement of a fact, "He who is over all is God blessed for ever;" (*d.*) is an expression of feeling, an ascription of praise.   The latter is both more in accordance with the course of the author's thought and language in the preceding verses, and is less difficult of explanation so far as the formation of the sentence itself is concerned.   In the preceding verses the Apostle has exhibited strong feeling, and has set forth the honors of his own people.   To break out into a doxology is not altogether unnatural under the circumstances.   To frame his doxology in this form, "May he *who is over all*, God, be blessed forever," is singular, indeed, but not inexplicable.   In the ardor of feeling and outburst of praise, he might express his idea of God's providential care and blessing by the words *who is over all*.   But if he is framing a proposition and declaring a fact, it scarcely seems probable that he would have used this language, which is certainly not the most appropriate to the thought.   He would more naturally, and therefore more probably, have said, *who is the author of these blessings*, or *who has bestowed so much upon Israel*.   Moreover, the mere formal statement, that he

who gave the gifts, or he who is over all, is God, seems unnecessary and altogether unlikely to have been made between verse fifth and verse sixth.   Any one who will compare the passage with 2 Cor. i. 21, 22, will appreciate, we think, the fitness of the expression there used, and the unfitness of such an expression here.

If, then, the sentence refers to God, it must be regarded, in our judgment, as a doxology in the ordinary and strict sense, *God be blessed*, and the doxology must include all the words, and not θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας only.

But, admitting both of these points, are the words to read as in (*d.*) or as in (*a.*)?   We think that here, again, (*d.*) is to have the preference.   By adopting (*d.*) we have the sentence in a form which *may possibly* present that emphatic prominence of the subject which is claimed as the reason for placing it before the doxological word. "He who is over all, God," can perhaps describe God as the object of praise because his providential rule has bestowed the blessings. "He who is God over all" is a phrase, on the other hand, more naturally adapted to express the simple idea of God's exaltation and dominion.

The suggestion of the American Revisers, therefore, is the one which seems most deserving of adoption for the marginal note.   The interpretation, however, which places the period after πάντων, and connects "who is over all" with Christ,—making the doxology to be *God be blessed for ever,*—may also be worthy of record in the Revision. But this must be considered as doubtful.

We close our paper with two or three remarks not in the immediate line of the argument.

First.   It is not vital to the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ to find the declaration that he is God in this verse.   The Apostle Paul may have believed that his Lord and Saviour was Divine, and may teach this in his Epistles ; and yet he may have chosen to limit himself in the use of the name, *God*, so far as to apply it to the Father only.   If, then, it be discovered, beyond question, that he never in any single instance uses the word θεός of Christ, the doctrine may still be unshaken.   The more careful and systematic study of the New Testament has been showing the Christian Church, in recent times, that its truths are founded less upon individual verses or proof texts, and more upon the great and pervading thought which fills all its books.   In this great and pervading thought, as relating to our Lord, we find the declaration of his Divine nature ; a declaration which stands fast and abides, though the interpretation of particular

sentences may change as time passes on. If, however, this verse does contain the apostolic testimony that Christ is God, it is a direct affirmation of what the opposite doctrine would deny, and excludes that doctrine altogether.

We may add, in this connection, that, if the doctrine of Christ's divinity be established from other passages or other parts of the New Testament, this fact, by itself, will not prove that θεός here refers to him. It will only add to and confirm the probability derived from the examination of the verse, that it has this reference.

Secondly. The presentation of the subject, which has been made, shows the groundlessness and inappropriateness of the extreme assertions which have been indulged in by advocates of both views of this passage. It has been declared, on the one hand, by those who refer the words to Christ that the rules of construction absolutely exclude any other reference ; that doctrinal prejudice alone has been the cause of any denial of this explanation ; that there is no ground for such denial which is founded in reason ; that it argues mental or moral blindness, even, to support the opposite view. On the other hand, it has been affirmed that the interpretation which does not apply the sentence to God as a doxology is impossible, if the rules and principles of the Greek language are considered ; and that it is, indeed, little short of absurd. The fair and unprejudiced considera- tion of the words draws us away from all such extravagant statements, and brings us to the calm inquiry into the arguments for both sides, and the decision as to the probabilities within the sphere of language and grammatical construction. The presence of the two renderings in the Revised Version, as it comes into general use, will tend to make all theologians and readers recognize that there is a possibility of both renderings, while yet there is a probability that the one given in the text is correct.

Thirdly. It is a fact worthy of notice, that of the most prominent opponents of the reference of the passage to Christ—such writers, for example, as de Wette, Grimm, Rückert, Meyer, Jowett—each one admits a peculiar force as belonging to some particular argument among those which are urged in favor of that reference. Rückert says, that the naturalness of the connection of ὁ ὤν with χριστός points strongly towards this understanding of the clause, and that the sentence moves on most fitly and satisfactorily in this way. de Wette remarks that the demand for a contrast, which is found in τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, is the point of most difficulty to be overcome, and he evi- dently regards it as of serious moment. Jowett expresses the opinion that the omission of the verb, "the defective and awkward grammar,"

is the strongest objection to the interpretation as a doxology to God. Grimm states that the inappropriateness of using ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, in this connection, with respect to God—that is, as describing his relation to the blessings of the Israelites—is the thing which holds his mind back from applying the phrase to God.   Meyer allows the force of everything, as it were, except for the want of instances elsewhere in which the Apostolic writers use θεός of Christ.   We cannot but regard the fact that these scholars find a strength in the various arguments, which it is hard to overcome—one looking upon one point as presenting very serious difficulty, and another upon another, until, as we read what is said by them all, we see that they are pressed by the weight of all the considerations—as showing that there is a real force in each one, taken by itself, and a cumulative force in the sum of them, when united together.   If such advocates of the opposite view acknowledge that the argument, from stage to stage, causes even themselves to give it their most respectful consideration, the position of those who interpret the clause of Christ must be a strong one, and the reasons which support it must be such as ought to influence candid minds.

We have set forth these reasons and defended this position, with a due estimate as we trust, and with a fair presentation, of what is urged upon the other side.   The interpreter is called, by the very duties and obligations of his profession, to be a calm, honest, unprejudiced inquirer after truth—to be a judge, not an interested advocate.

A Paraphrase of the Song of Deborah.

—◆—

BY PROF. THOMAS H. RICH.

—◆—

That the strong in Israel laid bare their strength ;
That the people came to battle willingly ;
          Praise ye the Lord !

Hear, O ye kings of earth ! ye princes, lend your ear !
I, of the Lord, I fain would sing; would touch the harp,
In honor of the Lord, the God of Israel !

Lord, when Thou wentst our from Seir ;
When Thou didst march from Edom's field ;
      Earth quaked ; yea, heaven dissolved ;
      Yea, clouds dissolved in rain !
Mountains shook at presence of the Lord ;—
Sinai there, at presence of the Lord,
          The God of Israel !

In days of Shamgar, Anath's son ;
In days of Jael, idle lay the ways ;
And such as follow trodden paths,
      Went ways circuitous.
Idle lay the villages in Israel—idle,
Until I, Deborah, arose—arose,
And like a mother wrought for Israel.

          He chose new gods ;
          Then war was at his gates ;
          Nor shield appeared, nor lance,
          'Mong Israel's forty thousand men.

My heart goes out to the leaders of Israel ;
To the people that came to battle willingly ;
          Praise ye the Lord !

Ye, who on white asses ride ;
Ye, who on rich carpets sit ;
And ye, who tread the way, in toil for bread ;
        Muse on the victory !
For voice of archers at the water troughs—
There be rehearsed the righteous acts the Lord hath done ;
His righteous acts done for his villages in Israel.
    Then from their refuges on high,
The people of the Lord came to their gates again,
        No foe to fear !

Awake, Deborah, awake !
Awake, awake, the triumph sing !
        Up, Barak, Abinoam's son,
And lead thy captives to captivity !

Then, a remnant of the nation's noblemen,
    Down to the battle came ;
The Lord among those heroes—joy to me—
    Came down to Jezreel !
From Ephraim—they rooted in Mount Amalek.
    Next thee Benjamin, joined with thy hosts.
From Machir, leaders with their trains came down ;
And out of Zebulon they onward march,
        With captain's staff.
And princes of Issachar with Deborah league ;
    And Issachar like Barak brave,
        Down to the vale his feet impel.

By streams of Reuben, were determinations great.
    Why tarrying still amid the fold ?
    Is bleat of flock so sweet to hear ?
At streams of Reuben, were deliberations great ;
        But none the battle sought !

    Gilead beyond Jordan rests ;
And Dan—why sojourns he in ships ?
    Asher by the seashore abides,
And at his havens resteth quietly.

Zebulon is a people that accounts it nought to die !
    And Naphtali, of mountain home !

    Kings came ; they fought.
    Then kings of Canaan fought ;
At Tanaach, by waters of Megiddo—
        Spoil of silver failed to take !
        The Heavens against them fought ;

The stars their courses left to fight with Sisera.
 Kishon's brook swept them away—
Brook of ancient days—Kishon's brook.
 My soul contemns their strength !

Then hoofs of horses smote the ground ;
For on and on their warriors dashed—
  A troubled multitude !

Curse ye Meroz, saith the Angel of the Lord ;
 Curse, curse ye her inhabitants,
  Coming not to help the Lord—
To help the Lord amid the heroes of the land.

 Jael, Kenite Heber's wife—
Let her, beyond women blessed be !
 Beyond women, who in tents abide,
  Let her blessed be !
 Water he asked, she gave him milk ;
 In costly bowl she offered cream.
 But deep his sleep, within her tent,
 Her hand out to the nail she stretched,
And her right hand to hammer used in toil ;
And hammered Sisera ; she brake his head ;
And crushed, and pierced his temples through.
At her feet he sank, he fell, he lay ;
 At her feet he sank, he fell ;
Where he sank, there he fell—a *worthless* thing.

Through the window there looks forth, and cries aloud—
Through the lattice—the mother of Sisera :
 Why does his chariot delay to come !
  Why step his steeds so slow !

The wisest of her princesses reply—
But her own word she still repeats unto herself—
 " Surely they booty find and share ;
A maiden, two maidens, for each man ;
 Booty of garments bright for Sisera ;
 Booty of garments bright, with needle wrought ;
A garment bright, on both sides wrought—
  Booty for me to wear !

So perish *all* who hate Thee, Lord !
 But them who love Him—
Let them like the sun go forth,
  In strength of victory !

The Babylonian Element in Ezekiel.

—•—

BY PROF. C. H. TOY, D. D.

—•—

§ I.   EZEKIEL'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS BABYLON.

1.   The almost complete silence of the earlier prophets, down to the end of the 7th century, B. C., in respect to the Babylonian kingdom, is what we should expect from the political relations of the time, and the method of the prophetic exhortations.   The prophets were practical preachers and statesmen, who dealt with foreign nations only as these came into actual contact with Israel, and from the time of Amos to that of Jeremiah Babylon was merely a restless, hardly-managed dependency of Assyria, with no important independent political power, not formidable as an enemy, or valuable as a friend.   After various revolts and wars it was finally completely subdued B. C., 710 by Sargon, who took the title of King of Babylon, and held his court in the city probably for several years; and it seems to be just at this time that Micah declared (ch. iv. 10) that Judah should be carried away out of the city into the country and as far as Babylon.   It was not long after the destructive expedition of Sargon into southern Palestine, which filled the land with dismay (B. C. 712 or 711), and was not improbably connected with the embassy of Marduk-bal-iddin (Isa. xxxix.), who before his last, ill-fated struggle for independence, may have wished to gain the friendship of the petty kings of Palestine. The genuineness of the prediction ascribed to the prophet Isaiah in Isa. xxxix., 2 Kings xx. may fairly be regarded as doubtful, seeing that this whole historical insertion (chs. xxxvi.–xxxix.) bears the marks of a later date, and the book of Kings belongs to the period of the exile.   The mention of Babylon in Micah, then, the only one certainly earlier than Jeremiah, is nothing but a consequence of the temporary position of the King of Assyria in that city, and has nothing to do with a kingdom of Babylon.   The sole mention of this last is found in the prediction of Isaiah, if this be genuine.

2.   In B. C. 625 the Assyrian empire fell before the attack of the Medes and Babylonians, who divided its territory between them, Palestine naturally falling to the latter; Josiah, King of Judah, became a vassal of Babylon and lost his life in an attempt to prevent Pharaoh Necho from marching against his suzerain.   The prophet Jeremiah assumed the same friendly attitude towards Babylon, opposed with all his might alliance with Egypt and rebellion against Nebuchadrezzar, wrote to the captives to make themselves at home in the land of their exile, and carried his advocacy of the Babylonian supremacy so far as to incur the suspicion of treachery to his own country, and the hearty hatred of the national party.   He spoke no word against Babylon, but predicted a speedy return of Israel to their own land.

3.   On this point Ezekiel is completely at one with Jeremiah— while he looks to his people's restoration to Canaan, he is thoroughly friendly to Babylon.   He sides with Nebuchadrezzar against Egypt and Tyre—promises to the Babylonian King the spoil of the latter (xxvi. 7–14), and when his attack had failed* gives him Egypt in compensation (xxix. 18–20).   In portraying the attack of Gog on Israel, the allies whom he assigns to the northern horde are nearly identical with the allies of Tyre the enemy of Nebuchadrezzar.   He has no word of blame or reproof for the King of Babylon—he does not denounce him for holding Israel in captivity—when the tidings of the fall of Jerusalem come, it is not against the conqueror but against Israel that he lifts up his voice (xxxiii. 21–29)—the judgment of God on Ammon, Moab, Edom and Philistia is announced for their hostility to Israel, but there is no word of judgment on Babylon.   This forbearance is extended to the Babylonian religion. The idolatry of Israel is denounced, the idols of Egypt are to be destroyed, but Bel and Nebo and Marduk, Nebuchadrezzar's special god are unmentioned.

4.   All this is in striking contrast with the tone of later prophecies, as Jer. l,. li.; Isa. xiii., xiv., xlvi. xlvii, in which Babylon is treated as the enemy of Israel, and therefore to be punished with destruction.

5.   The difference of tone is explained by the difference of the historical circumstances.   To Jeremiah and Ezekiel Babylon was the supreme political power of the world, victorious over all enemies, firmly established, and therefore the safest guardian of Israel.   They saw that it would be madness in a petty kingdom in Palestine to set itself

---

*Whether Nebuchadrezzar took Tyre or not (on which point Josephus' citation of authorities seems to me to amount to little), still the prophet says that neither he nor his army had wages for his service against Tyre.

up against this overwhelming force.   They believed that God's prov-
idence now pointed to submission; that, as he used the Babylonian
King to chastise sinful Israel, so he had his own plans for the restora-
tion of his people to national dignity and righteous prosperity, and
that those plans could be carried out only by yielding to the superior
strength of Babylon, repenting of sin, turning to Yahwe and hus-
banding the national resources for the future.

The aspect of things naturally changed when Cyrus entered on his
conquering career, and approached the Euphrates.   The prophets
looked on him as the agent of the glorious deliverance that God had in
store for Israel.   Babylon, on the other hand, was now regarded as the
oppressive power that held the chosen people back from the enjoy-
ment of its rights—this power must be crushed in order that Israel
may be restored.   In the second Isaiah and Jer. l. and li. there is no
friendly feeling for Babylon, nothing but bitter reproach for its pride,
sarcasm for its religion, and exultation over its approaching downfall.

This prophetic point of view is not ethical or religious, but na-
tional.   The Babylon of Ezekiel was not less proud, oppressive and
idolatrous than that of the second Isaiah.   There is no indication
that the policy of Nabunahid, who surrendered to Cyrus, was differ-
ent from that of Nebuchadrezzar who destroyed Jerusalem.   The
Babylonian treatment of the Jewish exiles appears to have been
humane and liberal throughout.   But in the days of Ezekiel Israel's
hope was in keeping quiet and maintaining friendly relations with
Babylon, and the prophet has no word to say against its moral and
religious character; in the days of Cyrus the hope of Israel was in
Babylon's overthrow, and the prophets of the time freely denounce it
on ethical and religious grounds.   They were single-minded in their
devotion to their people—they held up for them the standard of holi-
nesss of life as the condition of Yahwe's favor—nevertheless their judg-
ment of foreign nations was determined by the political relation of
these to Israel.

6.   Ezekiel, then, is definitely on the side of Babylon.   He sees
no hope of present independence for Israel, and his utterances consist
almost entirely of castigation of his people's sins, and elaboration of
a plan of national life for the restoration.   It does not appear that his
sympathy with Babylon brought him into disfavor with the people.
They were deaf, indeed, to his exhortations (xxxiii. 32), but the elders
came to inquire of Yahwe through him (xx. 1), and he seems to have
been uniformly treated with respect.

§ II. BABYLONIAN IDEAS.

1.   Ezekiel's position would naturally bring him into contact with
Babylonian ideas, and his friendly attitude towards the country would
predispose him to accept them in so far as this was not inconsistent
with his loyalty to his own people and religion.   How far the books
of the public libraries at Babylon and elsewhere would be accessible to
him we have no means of knowing; but a residence of thirty years
must have taught him much.   It is to be regretted that he says so
little of Babylonian customs and ideas; the reports of such an observer
would have been of the highest value for us.   As it is, we have only
one or two general hints besides the history of the Garden of Eden.

2.   The belomancy described in xxi. 26 f. (Eng. Vers. 21 f.) was a
common practice in Babylon and elsewhere.   It is referred to nowhere
else in the Old Testament, but is natural in the mouth of Ezekiel,
who might have seen the ceremony performed, as we now have it
figured on Assyrian and Babylonian monuments (see Lenormant, *La
Divination*, ch. II.)

The first date of the beginning of Ezekiel's ministry (chap. i. 1)
seems also to be reckoned from the era of Nabopalassar B. C. 625, from
which to 594 would be about thirty years.   The only other sup-
position that has any plausibility, namely, that the prophet gives the
year of his own life, is rendered improbable by the phraseology, which
is in the manner of reckoning from a chronological epoch; nowhere
else is such a mode of giving a man's age found.   This date (verse
1) seems to be from the prophet himself; the second date (verse 2),
which gives the Jewish reckoning, is from the hand of an editor, who
speaks of Ezekiel in the third person.   It would appear, therefore, that
Ezekiel had adopted the Babylonian mode of reckoning time, an in-
dication that he had not held himself aloof from the life of the nation
in whose midst his lot was cast.

3.   Another apparent point of contact between Ezekiel and
Babylon, I mean his use of Eden and the cherub, requires more care-
ful consideration.

Let us first look at the occurrence of those words in the books of
the Old Testament whose date can be fixed with some approach to
exactness.

Outside of the Pentateuch Eden, as the name of the primeval par-
adise, is found only twice in other books than Ezekiel.   Isa. li. 3
mentions it simply as the "garden of Yahwe," a type of fertility and
gladness; I hold this passage to belong to about B. C. 540.   With
this may be compared Gen. xiii. 10, where the plain of the Jordan is

similarly compared to the "Garden of Yahwe"; in Gen. ii., iii., the name is the "garden of Eden," or simply the "garden." In Joel ii. 3 this fuller phrase also occurs: the land is likened to the "garden of Eden." The prophecy of Joel seems to me to be post-exilian. It is not my purpose here to go into a discussion of the date of Isa. xl.–lxvi. and Joel. In regard to the latter I will only say that the reference to the temple as existing (i. 14) and to the people as being partly in captivity (iv. 1, 2), the mention of Tyre and Sidon and Philistia as principal enemies of Israel (iv. 4–6) together with Edom and Egypt, the silence respecting a King of Judah, and the general religious phraseology appears to me to point to a time not long after the building of the second temple. If this view is correct, reference to Eden outside of the Pentateuch does not occur before Ezekiel. If Joel be put just before the exile or even in the beginning of the eighth century B. C., there is still nothing more than a bare mention of Eden except in Ezekiel and the Pentateuch.

A similar remark may be made of the cherub. Leaving out the general reference in the post-exilian psalm civ. 3, 4, we find outside of Ezekiel and the Pentateuch only Ps. xviii. 11, where the cherub is a personification of the thunder-cloud or a symbolical creature, its form not described, which somehow stands in connection with this phenomenon. There is the related conception of the seraph in Isa. vi. Both of these appear to belong to the popular idea of the Israelites, and may date from the beginning of their history.

When we turn to Ezekiel we find the pictures of Eden and the cherub drawn with remarkable fulness of detail. First his references to Eden: "Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering . . . the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes (or, jewel-settings) was prepared for thee in the day that thou wast created . . . thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created till iniquity was found in thee" (xxviii. 13, 15) "The cedars in the Garden of God could not hide him; the cypresses were not like his boughs, and the plane-trees were not like his branches" (xxxi. 8). The resemblance of this picture to that in Genesis and its greater elaborateness in certain respects lie on the surface. And Ezekiel recurs to it again and again. The great prominence that he gives to it and the fulness of detail into which he enters indicate special interest in the story on his part and special sources of information. Where could he have got the information except from Babylonia? And, remembering the silence of all Old Testament writers before him on these points, does it not become probable that it is now for the first time that the Eden history takes shape among

the Israelites, and that it was incorporated into the prepatriarchal narrative after the exile?

Ezekiel has three different representations of the cherub: 1. xxviii. 14, which seems to be derived from the figure in Solomon's temple— the epithet "covering" being suggested by the fact that the cherubim "covered" the mercy-seat with their wings (1 K. viii. 7; Ex. xxv. 20), the "anointed" either referring solely to the king, or a general epithet of the cherub as a part of the sanctuary which was consecrated by anointing (Ex. xl. 9)—the "holy mountain of God" may be the temple-hill, or it may be specially a designation of the altar with its burning coals or "stones of fire" (cp. Isa. vi. 6); in xlii. 15 the altar is called "mountain of God" (הראל) and "hearth of God" (אראל or אריאל) as being the center and essence of the sacrificial service; in the midst of this hearth the cherub is said to walk as the representative of God himself or of his ideally perfect creature and minister.   It does not appear what the form of this cherub was except that it was winged, and the Babylonian monuments present nothing similar to it.   I pass it by, therefore, with the single remark that, as a Phenician was the designer of Solomon's temple, it is not likely that its cherub-figure came from Egypt, it was more probably Babylonian in its origin, though we are unable to give proofs of such an origin, and that, as to the cherub of Exodus in the Tabernacle, our opinion of its form will depend on our view of the date and historical value of the descriptions of that book.   2. In Ezekiel's opening vision the cherub-face is identified in one place (x. 14) with that of the ox, though in the same connection the name cherub is given to the complex living creature with its four faces of ox, man, lion and eagle (ver. 1, 3, &c.)—the feet were those of a calf, but the general appearance was human.   3. In the description of the temple (xli. 18, 19) the cherub carved on the walls had only two faces, lion and human, and this is all that is said of it.   It may be assumed that these last two forms were of Babylonian origin; Lenormant gives satisfactory proof of this in his "Origines de l'histoire," ch. iii.   It is not necessarily true that the cherub-forms were bodily copies of Babylonian figures—the prophet may have got from these only the suggestion of composite creatures, and fashioned his material to suit the symbolism he had in mind. But the whole conception of this symbolism seems to be Babylonian in form, though the lofty moral and religious ideas attached to it by the prophet are the product of Israelitish thought.

4.   One other point may be suggested—whether Ezekiel got a hint or impulse towards a more completely organized religious cultus and ritual from the Babylonians.   There is extant no codification of the

priestly ritual before the exile—we are left to gather its details from the rare and brief statements of the historical books and the psalms. While in the book of Deuteronomy we have the Tora as it was conceived by the prophets in the early part of Josiah's reign or perhaps a half-century before, and in Leviticus the fully developed priestly ritual of the time of Ezra and Nehemiah and later, we find only in Ezekiel any formal statement of temple-ritual in the times preceding Ezra's visit to Jerusalem from Babylon.   That there was such a ritual we may take it for granted, and we may be equally sure that Ezekiel's sketch was not inferior in fulness of elaboration to what existed before him.   What led him to draw up this complete scheme of temple-service, found in chs. xliii.–xlvi. of his book ?   Jeremiah, in whom, however, the priest seems to have been sunk in the prophet, thought of nothing of this sort.   Hilkiah, who was high-priest under Josiah when the book of the Tora was found in the temple, attempted no codification—this was left to the priest-prophet of the Babylonian exile.

Now there was undoubtedly a good deal in the circumstances of the time to force on Ezekiel's attention the necessity of some such rigid ritual scheme of national life as he gives in the last chapters of his book.   The nation seemed to him going to pieces politically, and morally and religiously; the main reason of this was their faithlessness to their God, their neglect of his worship, and this worship would be secured by a strict temple-law.   The restored nation must be guided by a more definite rule of service than had hitherto existed.

This is true.   Yet it is worth while to ask whether the idea of presenting this better defined scheme was not fostered and brought to maturity by the ecclesiastical system of the people among whom he was living.   We have already seen reason to believe that he was in somewhat close contact with them, that he had opportunity of knowing their customs, that he possibly admired and honored this nation whose dread king was so potent an instrument in the hands of the God of Israel for carrying out his designs.   The Jews were never in these early times, as they have never since been, averse to getting suggestions from their neighbors.   In Ezekiel's time the Babylonian cultus was not only elaborate, but was recorded in books.   The numerous and splendid ceremonies, the offerings, the interpretation of omens, the celebration of feast-days of deities required the constant care of a host of priests, who were supported by the gifts of the worshipers and from the property attached to the temples.   It was a religious organization far in advance of that which existed in Israel, and it would not be strange if acquaintance with so well arranged a

system suggested to the prophet the desirability of something like it for his own people.

There are not data for a detailed comparison between Ezekiel's scheme and the Babylonian temple-organization, nor is it likely that he took from the latter much more than the general idea. The materials were already at hand in existing customs, which he had merely to develop and systematize. The provision that would most naturally suggest a borrowing is the assignment of land near the temple to the priests—an arrangement that then existed in Babylon, but seems not to have existed in Israel up to that time.

So far as appears, the movement for a stricter ritual, which culminated in Ezra's visit to Jerusalem, originated with Ezekiel. Its influence on the succeeding history of the Jews is familiar—it gathered up the formal elements of the nation's religious life into a mass, and carried it on to the point that called for the prophetic protest of John the Baptist, and the completion of Israel's spiritual development in Jesus Christ.

It is hardly necessary to remark that such a borrowing as this in no wise detracts from the true religious originality of Israel. The nation cast the materials thus gained from other peoples into the crucible of its own thought, and thence produced ideas, whose superiority to those of the Babylonians is demonstrated by the history of the world. To trace the genesis of Jewish religious forms and ideas is to follow the guidance of God by which the Jews became the religious teachers of the world and prepared the way for Jesus of Nazareth. Whatever the seed, and whatever the soil into which it was cast, the fruit was no less the creation of the Divine maker of all things, in whose hands all the experiences of Israel were fashioned into a form destined to be one of the great educating influences of the race.

On the Use of לֵב and Καρδία in the Old and New Testaments.

BY PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D. D., LL. D.

———•———

The word לֵב, with its cognates, לֵבָב, &c., designates *the heart*, in the first place, of course, as the physical organ, the centre of *life;* and one is tempted to suspect some genetical relation to the German Leben and our English word "life." Then, it stands for the central part in general, the inside, and so for *the interior man* as manifesting himself in all his various activities, in his desires, affections, emotions, passions, purposes, his thoughts, perceptions, imaginations, his wisdom, knowledge, skill, his beliefs and his reasonings, his memory and his consciousness. It is not especially confined to the feelings and moral acts in distinction from the intellectual, except as there is more frequent occasion for its use in the former application than in the latter. It designates the central basis for the functions of the whole inner man.

These words, לֵב, לֵבָב, &c., are more frequently translated "mind" in our received version of the Old Testament than any other word, including such cases as "dead man out of mind," "bring to mind," "remember or come to mind," "this I recall to mind," &c. For this purpose, נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ come next in frequency.

1. Under לֵב are included such expressions as "imagination of the thoughts of his heart," "imagination of man's heart," Gen. vi. 5; viii. 21; also in Zechariah and in Jeremiah many times; "said in his heart," Gen. xvii. 17 ; "speaking in my heart," xxiv. 45 ; "wise-hearted," *i. e.* skilful, Exod. xxxi. 6 ; "wisdom of heart," xxxv. 35; "in whose heart the Lord hath put wisdom," *i. e.* skill, xxxvi. 2 ;

"an heart to perceive," Deut. xxix. 4 ; "in the imagination of mine heart," xxix. 19 ; "told all his heart," *i. e.* all he knew, Jud. xvi. 17; "an understanding heart," לֵב שֹׁמֵעַ, 1 Kings iii. 9 ; "I have given thee a wise heart," iii. 12 ; "feignest them out of thine own heart," Neh. vi. 8; "meditation of my heart," Ps. xix. 14; xlix. 3; "thoughts of his heart," xxxiii. 11 ; "heart inditing a good matter," xlv. 1 ; "write on the table of thine heart," Prov. iii. 3 ; "thine heart retain my words," iv. 4 ; "heart seeketh knowledge," xv. 14 ; "a man's heart deviseth his way," xvi. 9; "my heart had great experience of wisdom," Eccles. i. 16 ; "a wise man's heart discerneth both time," &c., viii. 5 ; "consider in his heart," Isa. xliv. 19.

לְבַב is used in such cases as "consider in thine heart," Deut. iv. 39 ; "thought in thy heart," xv. 9 ; "ye know in all your hearts," Josh. xxiii. 14 ; "understand with their heart," Isa. vi. 10 ; "heart of the rash shall understand," xxxii. 4 ; "thoughts of thy heart," Dan. ii. 30 ; "beast's heart given," iv. 16 : v. 21 : and vii. 4 ; "shut their hearts (fem. pl.) that they cannot understand," Isa. xliv. 18.

נֶפֶשׁ is used for the affections quite as familiarly as לֵבָב, and, in that sense, is translated sometimes "heart," but generally "soul."

If it be said, as to the connection of לֵב with wisdom, that, in the Proverbs and elsewhere, wisdom is a moral quality, and so לֵב in the sense of the affections is appropriately used with it ; let it be observed that בִּין, בִּינָה, and תְּבוּנָה are also used in connection with this wisdom, and that in the most striking cases, as (בִין,) "O ye simple, understand wisdom," Prov. viii. 5 ; (בִּינָה.) "Get understanding," "with all thy getting, get understanding," iv. 5 and iv. 7 ; "counsel is mine, I am understanding," viii. 14 ; "the knowledge of the holy is understanding," ix. 10 ; (תְּבוּנָה) "bow thine ear to my understanding," v. 1 ; "and understanding put forth her voice," viii. 1 ; "a man of understanding hath wisdom," (note that it is not the converse), x. 23 ; "a man of understanding walketh uprightly," xv. 21 ; "is of an excellent spirit," xvii. 27. So Isa. xi. 2, "the spirit of wisdom and understanding" (בִּינָה); and "ye fools, be of an understanding heart," (בִין), Prov. viii. 5.

Καρδία.

The use of *Καρδία* in the New Testament corresponds almost perfectly to that of לֵב in the Old Testament. . It stands for the *mind*, the inner man, Lat. animus :—thus, "Think evil in your hearts," Matt. ix. 4; "should understand with their heart," xiii. 15; "out of the heart proceed evil thoughts," xv. 19; "reasoning in their hearts," Mark ii. 6; "not doubt in his heart," xi. 23; "imagination of their hearts," Luke i. 51; "pondered them in her heart," ii. 19; "mused in their hearts," iii. 15; "slow of heart to believe," xxiv. 25; "they considered not for their heart was hardened," Mark vi. 52; "have ye your hearts hardened? . . . do ye not yet understand?" Mark viii. 17, because they did not apprehend about the leaven of the Pharisees; so in Acts xix. 9, "divers were hardened and believed not;" "therefore," says St. John, "they could not believe because that Esaias said again, he hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, lest they should . . . understand with their heart"; and so for other cases of hardening the heart;—to "blind the mind" and "harden the heart," seem to be parallel expressions for the same thing;—again, "why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart?" Acts v. 4; "show the work of the law in their hearts, . . . their thoughts accusing or excusing," Rom. ii. 15; "shalt believe in thine heart," x. 9; "neither have entered into the heart of man the things," 1 Cor. ii. 9; "written in our hearts," iii. 2; "I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them," Heb. x. 16; "till the day-star arise in your hearts," 2 Pet. ii. 19.

With καρδία are connected διαλογισμοί, "out of the heart proceed thoughts," Matt. xv. 19; Mark vii. 21; "thoughts of many hearts," Luke ii. 35; "Jesus perceived the thoughts of their hearts," ix. 47; "why do thoughts arise in your hearts," xxiv. 38;—also ἐνθυμήσεις, "discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart," Heb. iv. 12; ἐνθυμέομαι, "wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?" Matt. ix. 4;—also ἐπίνοια, "if perhaps the thought of thine heart," Acts viii. 22, and "hast thought," νομίζω, viii. 20;—also διάνοια, "imagination of their hearts," Luke i. 51. Διάνοια is also used in the moral sense like Καρδία, "desires of the flesh and the mind," Eph. ii. 3; "enemies in your mind by wicked works," Col. i. 21; "I will put my laws into their mind," Heb. viii. 10; "I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them," Heb. x. 16; "gird up the loins of your mind, be sober," 1 Pet. i. 13; "Stir up your pure

minds," 2 Pet. iii. 1;—also ἔννοια, "arm yourselves likewise with the same mind," 1 Pet. iv. 1;—also νόημα, "their minds were blinded . . . for the veil is upon their heart," 2 Cor. iii. 14; "hath blinded the mind of them that believe not," 2 Cor. iv. 4; "so your minds should be corrupted," xi. 3; "shall keep your hearts and minds," Phil. iv. 7;—also νοῦς, "God gave them over to a reprobate mind," Rom. i. 28; "warring against the law of my mind," vii. 23; "with the mind I myself serve the law of God," vii. 25; "transformed by the renewing of your mind," xii. 2; "renewed in the spirit of your mind," Eph. iv. 23; "disputings of men of corrupt minds," 1 Tim. vi. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 8;—also φρόνημα and φρονέω, as φρόνημα σαρκός, Rom. viii. 7; and φρόνημα πνεύματος, viii. 27; φρονέω τοῦτο, Phil. ii. 5; "savourest not the things that be of God," Matt. xvi. 23 and Mark viii. 33; "do mind the things of the flesh," Rom. viii. 5; —also ψυχή, "minds evil-affected," Acts xiv. 2;—also, finally, and most striking of all, μετανοέω, and μετάνοια are the words used precisely for what we should call "a change of heart,"—not μεταχαρδία but μετάνοια.

Thus לֵב and χαρδία are the subject or seat, not only of the affections, but of thought, imagination, meditation, memory, perception, reflection, knowledge, skill, belief, judgment, reasoning, consciousness; and, on the other hand, other words which are admitted properly to refer to intellectual operations are familiarly used also for the affections and all the moral activities.

The word φρήν, pl. φρένες, standing for the reins or kidneys, or the diaphragm or caul, came to denote, after its physical sense, what we express by heart, as properly as did χαρδία; but, like χαρδία, it came also to stand for the whole mind. It is used but twice in the New Testament, and then in the same verse (1 Cor. xiv. 20), and is there translated "understanding." It is very curious that, while the ancients treated several of the internal physical organs as the seat of the mind, *e. g.*, not only the heart and kidneys or liver, but the breast, and even the stomach and bowels, they never hit upon the *brains* for that purpose;—except, perhaps, in Dan. iv. 13, "visions of my *head*";—although φρένες comes so provokingly near the English word in sound that we are almost tempted to seek for some mysterious etymological connection.

The Latin "cor" of the same root as the Greek χαρδία, was sometimes, though unfrequently, used for the cogitative or cognitive faculty. Through the French it has passed out into the special sense of *courage*. The English *heart*, of the same root as the Greek and

Latin words, is used almost exclusively for the seat of the affections and in direct contradistinction from the understanding.   Hence, with its distinct signification and contrasted associations, it fails to correspond as an exact equivalent to the looser Hebrew and Greek words; though we have one phrase left in which it has the sense of mind or memory, viz., "to learn by heart."   May we not well beware, therefore, lest, by basing our expositions and doctrinal teaching upon the special force of the English term, we really pervert the word of God, instead of inculcating high spiritual truth?

The ancients did not make the nice mental and linguistic analyses of modern thought.   They used לֵב, καρδία, בִּינָה, νοῦς, &c., for the whole inner man, now with special reference to one special faculty, or state, and now to another.   But καρδία, for example, is *never* in the New Testament contradistinguished from or contrasted with νοῦς, or διάνοια, &c.; and, when put side by side with them, it is by parallelism rather than distinction.   Thus, when it is said thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart (καρδία) and with all thy soul (ψυχή) and with all thy mind (διάνοια), it is not meant that heart, soul, mind, are distinct parts of man; each is the whole inner man, and they are all put together to make the expression of totality the stronger; and sometimes, to strengthen it still further, understanding (σύνεσις) and strength (ἰσχύς) are added.

Standing as it does for the inner man, καρδία is never contrasted with anything else within, but with what is without.   Thus our Saviour: Nothing from without entering into a man can defile him, but from within, out of the heart, proceed evil thoughts, &c.—and these defile a man.   We have no right to connect with καρδία the sharp distinctions with which we use the modern word *heart.*   Shall we say, for example, that believing with the heart is a different thing from believing with the mind?   The apostle says: "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."   Now here heart is not opposed to mind but to mouth, the inward to the outward; and "in the heart" adds no more to the believing than "with the mouth" adds to the confessing.   It is merely said that one is an internal act, and the other an external act.   It is no extraordinary kind of believing any more than it is an extraordinary kind of confession.   It is believing a logical proposition—"that God hath raised him from the dead."   No doubt the apostle means a true, honest, lively faith, and a true, honest confession; and this he would

equally mean, if "in the heart" and "with the mouth" were not there. Man believeth to righteousness, and confession is made unto salvation; he believeth with the inner man, and confesseth with the outer man.

—•—

On the use of ψυχή and πνεῦμα, and Connected Words in the Sacred Writings.

•
—•—

BY PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D. D., LL. D.

—•—

The words נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ in Hebrew, ψυχή and πνεῦμα in Greek, anima and spiritus in Latin, Seele and Geist in German, soul and ghost or spirit in English, are all alike derived from roots meaning air or some movement of air, as breathing, or a waving of the wind. In classical Greek ψυχή came to stand for the mind, the inner man, the immortal part of man; and, what is remarkable, it came to have a special reference to the departed spirits or shades; while נֶפֶשׁ, the corresponding Hebrew word, came to designate the dead body. The classical Greek never carried πνεῦμα beyond its physical sense, though the later Greek began to use it for life or the living being.

In the following paper it will be understood that, for the sake of greater brevity, whenever the English words soul and spirit are employed in reference to Old Testament passages, they correspond to the Hebrew words נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ, and in connection with the New Testament passages, to ψυχή and πνεῦμα, respectively; unless some other word is expressly given as the original term.

Spirit and soul are used interchangeably, or as parallel and equivalent expressions; each for the whole inner man, the whole man exclusive of the body; and both having the same predicates.

Isa. xxvi. 9, "With my soul have I desired thee, yea with my

spirit within me will I seek thee"; lvii. 16, "The spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made"; Luke i. 46, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour"; Phil. i. 27, "Stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving together"; Luke x. 21, "Rejoiced in spirit"; John xi. 33, "Groaned in spirit"; xiii. 21, "Troubled in spirit"; Mark viii. 12, "Sighed deeply in his spirit"; Acts xvii. 16, "Spirit stirred within him"; xviii. 5, "Pressed in spirit";—John xii. 27, "My soul is troubled"; 2 Pet. ii. 8, "Vexed his righteous soul"; Matt. xi. 29, "Ye shall find rest unto your souls"; xxvi. 38, and Mark xiv. 34, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful"; Luke ii. 35, "A sword shall pierce through thine own soul"; Gen. xlii. 21, "We saw the anguish of his soul"; Lev. xv. 29, 31, "Shall afflict your souls"; 1 Sam. i. 10, "She was in bitterness of soul", (also Job iii. 10); Jud. xvi. 16, "His soul was vexed", also Ps. vi. 3, &c.;—Gen. xli. 8, "Spirit troubled"; Ex. vi. 9, "anguish of spirit"; Job. vii. 11, "I will speak in the anguish of my spirit"; see also "a broken spirit", "a wounded spirit", "vexation of spirit", &c.

Thus the same affections are ascribed indiscriminately to the soul and to the spirit; and one stands for the man himself as much as the other.

The soul and the body are represented as constituting the whole man. Matt. x. 28, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna"; see also Luke xii. 5. Here "soul" is more than "the life"; for *that* man can destroy; it is the living being;—and Gehenna is more than the grave or the valley of Hinnom; for, according to St. Luke, man cannot cast into it. Here, too, it is plain the soul and the body are all there is of man. Micah vi. 7, "Fruit of my body for the sin of my soul"; Isa. x. 18, "Both soul and body"; Gen. xxxv. 18, "Her soul was in departing"; 1 Kings xix. 21, 22, "Let this child's soul come into him again."

Still more frequently are the spirit and body, in immediate contrast, thus represented:—Luke viii. 55, "Her spirit came again and she arose"; so, "into thy hands I commend my spirit"; "receive my spirit"; 1 Cor. vi. 20, "Glorify God in your body and in your spirit"; vii. 34, "Holy both in body and in spirit"; Eph. iv. 4, "One body, one spirit"; James ii. 26, "As the body without the spirit is dead," (where the spirit is recognized as the animating principle for the body); so Rev. xi. 11, "The spirit of life from God entered into them."

Our Lord himself contrasts spirit with flesh, σάρξ; never with body, σῶμα. "That which is born of the flesh," says he, "is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Here flesh does not mean the body, but the whole natural man, that which is the product or the result of natural generation; while the spirit does not denote what was in the man before as a constituent part of him, but that which is produced in him by the regenerating agency of the Divine Spirit. St. Paul uses flesh and spirit in the same way. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit," says he, "and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would", (Gal. v. 17); and again, "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh but in the spirit." Whence it is manifest that flesh is not synonymous with body, for they were in the body.

When, on another occasion, our Lord says, "the spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is weak", the flesh may mean much the same as body; but if so, the spirit means the same as soul or heart or mind; and thus the distinction is equivalent to that between soul and body.

There are a few other passages where spirit and flesh are brought into contrast or juxtaposition,—particularly Heb. xii. 9, 10: "Furthermore, the fathers of our flesh we had as chasteners, and we reverenced them; shall we not much rather submit ourselves unto the Father of the [our?] spirits and live?" This has been variously interpreted; and it has been cited as proving the doctrine of creationism, *i. e.*, that each human soul is created for each human body by an act of God. But this seems to ignore the fact that God is the maker of our bodies as well as of our spirits or souls; see Ps. cxxxix. 13–16. The allusion may be to the original Divine inbreathing whereby "man became a living soul"; or to the regenerating energy of the Divine Spirit. The *soul* is also spoken of much in the same way in Isa. lvii. 16: "The spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." For other passages similar to that in Hebrews, see Numb. xvi. 22: "O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh"; xxvii. 1, "The Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh"; Job. xii. 10, "In whose hand is the soul (נֶפֶשׁ) of all life, and the breath (רוּחַ) of all human flesh"; xxvii. 3, "The Spirit of God is in my nostrils"; xxxiii. 4, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath (נִשְׁמַת) of the Almighty hath given me life." In these passages the Spirit seems to stand for the breath or the animating principle in man; and God is simply represented as the author and

preserver of our lives, with special reference, it may be, to our minds.

Spirit and heart, soul and heart, are also used interchangeably and by way of parallelism:—Isa. li. 15, "To revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones"; Deut. ii. 30, "God hardened his spirit and made his heart," &c.; Ps. li. 10, "Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me"; li. 17, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart," &c.; Ezek. xviii. 21, "A new heart and a new spirit"; —as for heart and soul, see Matt. xxii. 37, "With all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind"; see also Mark xii. 30, and Luke xii. 19; Acts iv. 32, "Of one heart and of one soul"; Deut. iv. 29, "If thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul"; see also vi. 5; x. 12; xi. 13; xiii. 3; xxvi. 16, "Keep and do them with all thine heart and with all thy soul"; xxx. 2, "Obey with all thy heart and with all thy soul"; Joshua xxii. 5, "Serve him with all your heart and with all your soul"; xxiii. 14, "Ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls"; 2 Kings xxiii. 3, 25, "To keep his commandments with all their heart and with all their soul"; 1 Chron. xxii. 19, "Set your heart and your soul to seek the Lord"; Eph. vi. 5, 6, "In singleness of your heart, . . . doing the will of God from the soul"; and so, Col. iii. 22, 23, "In singleness of heart, fearing God; and whatsoever ye do, do it from the soul."

Spirit and mind are both contrasted and conjoined. In 1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15, spirit and νοῦς are contrasted : "My spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the understanding also." In Eph. iv. 23, they are conjoined or merged : "Renewed in the spirit of your mind, νοῦς." In 1 Cor. ii. 11, "The spirit of man in him" stands for his conscious being, it *knows* the things of the man.

Sin, perversion, pollution, are predicated alike of the soul, the spirit, the heart, and the mind. Lev. iv. 2, "If a soul sin ;" see also, vi. 2, etc.; xvii. 11, "Make an atonement for your souls" (here soul may mean merely the person); Hab. ii. 4, "His soul is not upright in him"; Ezek. xvlii. 4, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die"; xxxvi. 5, "With despiteful minds (souls)"; Micah. vi. 7, "The fruit of my body for the sin of my soul"; Acts xv. 24, "Subverting your souls"; 1 Pet. i. 22, "Ye have purified your souls"; 2 Pet. ii. 14, "Beguiling unstable souls"; Deut. ii. 10, "God hardened his spirit"; Judges ix. 23 ; 1 Sam. xvi. 14, 15, &c., "An evil spirit"; 1 Kings xxii. 21, 22, &c., "A lying spirit"; Ezek. xviii. 21, "A new heart and a new spirit"; see in Gospels, "Unclean spirits"; 2 Cor. vii. 1, "Filthiness of the flesh and spirit"; James iv. 5,

"The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy";—for "heart" no
citations are needed ;—for "mind," Eph. ii. 3, "desires of the flesh
of the mind (διανοία)"; Col. i. 21, "Enemies in mind (διανοία) by
wicked works ; 2 Cor. xi. 3, "So your minds (νοήματα) should be
corrupted"; Rom. i. 28, "Reprobate mind (νοῦς)"; Col. ii. 18,
"Puffed up by his fleshly mind (νοῦς)"; 1 Tim. vi. 5, "Corrupt
minds (νοῦς)"; Tit. i. 15, "Mind (νοῦς) and conscience is defiled";
Rom. viii. 7, "The mind of the flesh (φρόνημα σαρκός) is enmity
against God."

Righteousness and purity are similarly predicated, but no texts are
needed in proof.

Life after death, future punishment and salvation, are predicated
alike of the soul and of the spirit.

Job xxxii. 22, "His soul dwelleth near unto Sheol"; Ps. xvi. 10,
"Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol"; xxx. 3, "Brought up my
soul from Sheol"; Matt. x. 28, "Destroy both soul and body in
Gehenna"; John xii. 25, "He that hateth his life (ψυχή) in this
world shall keep it unto life (ζωή) eternal"; Matt. x. 39, "He that
findeth his life (ψυχή) shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my
sake shall find it"; also, xvi. 25, 27; Mark viii. 35, 38,—"Whoso-
ever shall lose his life (ψυχή) for my sake and the Gospel's, the same
shall save it," &c.; also, Luke ix. 24, 27; 2 Cor. xii. 15, "I will
most gladly spend and be spent for your souls"; Heb. vi. 19, "An
anchor of the soul"; 1 Peter ii. 11, 25, "Fleshly lusts, which war
against the soul"; "The shepherd and bishop of your souls"; Heb.
x. 39, "Saving of the soul"; James i. 21, "Able to save your
souls"; 1 Pet. i. 9, "Salvation of your souls"; iv. 19, "Commit
the keeping of your souls to him"; Rom. ii. 7, 9, "To those who
seek immortality, eternal life, but tribulation and anguish upon
every soul of man that doeth evil"; Rev. vi. 9, "I saw under the
altar the souls," &c.; xx. 4, "I saw the souls of them which were
beheaded," &c.;—Ps. xxxi. 5, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit";
see also Luke xxiii. 46; Eccles. iii. 21, the spirit of man that goeth
upward"; xii. 7, "The spirit shall return unto God who gave it";
1 Cor. v. 5, "That the spirit may be saved"; Heb. xii. 23, "Spirits
of just men made perfect"; 1 Pet. iii. 19, "The spirits in prison."

Both נֶפֶשׁ and ψυχή are sometimes, but particularly ψυχή, used in
a sort of wavering sense between what we express by "life" and what
we express by "soul," or as combining both senses. See the already
quoted passages, John xii. 25; Matt. x. 39; xvi. 26, &c.; Mark viii.
35-37; and Luke ix. 24, 25.

Sometimes נֶפֶשׁ is used of the life of *brutes*. Gen. i. **21, 24**, "Every living creature that moveth," "The living creature after his kind"; ii. 19, "Every living creature"; ix. 4, "Flesh with the life thereof . . . shall ye not eat"; iv. **12, 15, 16**, "Every living creature"; Lev. xxiv. 18, "Flesh with the life thereof"; also, xvii. 11, 14, and Deut. xii. 23; Numb. xxxi. 28, "One soul of five hundred both of the persons and of the beeves"; Job xii. 10, "The soul of every living thing, and the spirit (רוּחַ) of all mankind."

These fourteen are all the cases that I can find in the Old Testament in which the Hebrew word has this application. In the New Testament there are but two cases of ψυχή so used; Rev. viii. 9, "All which were in the sea and had life died"; and xvi. 3, "And every living soul died in the sea."

On the other hand, רוּחַ is used of *beasts* six times; Gen. vi. 17, "All flesh wherein is the breath of life"; so also, vii. **15, 22**; Ps. civ. 29, "Thou takest away their breath (רוּחָם)"; Eccles. iii. 19, "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts . . . yea they have all one breath (רוּחַ)"; 21, "The spirit of the beast that goeth downward."

And נֶפֶשׁ is used of God in the Old Testament nine times; Jud. xvi. 16, "His soul was grieved for the misery of the children of Israel": Isa. i. 14, "My soul hateth"; xiii. 2, "In whom my soul delighteth"; Jerem. v. 9 and ix. 9, "Shall not my soul be avenged?" xii. 7, "The dearly beloved of my soul"; xiv. 19, "Hath thy soul loathed Zion?" xxxii. 41, "With my whole heart and with my whole soul"; Lev. xxvi. 11, "My soul shall not abhor you." In the New Testament ψυχή is so applied twice; Matt. xii. 18, "In whom my soul is well pleased;" and Heb. x. 38, "My soul shall have no pleasure in him":—both cited from the Septuagint.

In general נֶפֶשׁ and ψυχή are distinguished from חַי and ζωή. The latter stand for life, living, in the *abstract*, (though חַי is also frequently used concretely, both as an adjective and for ζῶον). But the former are always *concrete*, and stand for somewhat that lives, either the vital principle itself or the living being; and so they come to represent the person, the soul, the self; which חַי and ζωή never do. This is the strongest evidence that they stand for the whole inner man; for the

centre of the consciousness of our inner being. Life (חַי) and soul (נֶפֶשׁ) are contradistinguished: Job x, 1, "My soul is weary of my life"; Ps. lxvi. 9, "Which holdeth our soul in life"; Prov. iii. 22, "So shall they be life unto thy soul"; see also John xii. 25, &c. For ζωή see also 1 Pet. iii. 10, "He that will love life,"—this is very different from loving his life, ψυχή; Jas. iv. 14, "What is your life? it is even a vapour"; 1 Tim. iv. 8, "Having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come"; 1 Cor. xv. 18, "If in this life only," &c. Of ψυχή such propositions are never made.

But as נֶפֶשׁ and ψυχή stand thus for the vital or animating principle, so also do רוּחַ and πνεῦμα ; as, "all flesh wherein is the breath of life," (Gen. v. 17; vii. 15, 22; &c.); "Her spirit came again and she arose," (Luke viii. 55); "As the body without the spirit is dead," (Jas. ii. 26.)

As the soul is the seat of the affections, so also, as we have seen, is the spirit. On the other hand, as the spirit is used for the rational mind, which is conscious of the things of man that are in him; so, also the soul *knows, thinks, remembers* : Psalms cxxxix. 14, "my soul knoweth right well"; Prov. xix. 2, "That the soul be without knowledge is not good"; 1 Sam. xx 4, "What thy soul speaketh"; Lam. iii. 20, "My soul hath them still in remembrance"; Josh. xxiii. 14, "Ye know in all your hearts, and in all your souls," &c.

As soul stands familiarly for the person, the self, the ego, so that " my soul," " thy soul," " his soul," often mean—though always probably with a certain peculiar modification of sense—the same as *I, thou, he;*—so also is the spirit used. Thus, Isa. xxxviii. 16, " In all these things is the life of my spirit; so wilt thou recover me and make me live"; " where " Life of my spirit " is *my life*; " My spirit " is myself, just as " My soul " is I. So also, " Hath refreshed my spirit and yours," (1 Cor. xvi. 18, also 2 Cor. vii. 13), *i. e.*, me and you. And thus, when, to the salutation: "The Lord be with you," it is answered, " And with thy spirit,"—" Thy spirit" means simply *thee.*

In Job xxxii. 8, it seems to be implied that the spirit, רוּחַ, belongs to man naturally; and the natural understanding is said to come into it, as it were, from the Spirit of God: " But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration (נִשְׁמָה) of the Almighty giveth him understanding.

That what is called πνεῦμα is *naturally* in man as well as what is called ψυχή is further evident from the words of St. Paul, which occur

in immediate connexion with his contrast of the natural or psychical
with the spiritual or pneumatical man: " For who of men," says he,
"Knoweth the things of man (or of the man, or man in general) save
the spirit of man (or of the man) which is in him?"   This spirit, then,
belongs to man as man, to all men; and it is here regarded as the
seat of human consciousness.

Thus then we have seen that:

(1) Spirit and soul are used indiscriminately for the whole inner
man.

(2) The same predicates, the same affections, are ascribed to both.

(3) Soul and body, or spirit and body, stand alike for the whole
man.

(4) Spirit and flesh have sometimes a special contrast, but not as
being constituent parts of our natural constitution.

(5) Heart is used interchangeably with spirit or with soul.

(6) Spirit and mind are contrasted as well as conjoined.

(7) Sin, pollution, perversion, as well as righteousness and purity,
are predicated alike of soul, spirit, heart and mind.

(8) Life after death, future punishment and salvation are predicated
alike of the soul and of the spirit.

(9) Spirit and soul are both used for the principle of life, the ani-
mating principle in the body.

(10) Both terms are used for the life of beasts; and both are used
in respect to God, in the New Testament as well as in the Old.

(11) Both are used to denote not only the seat of the affections,
but the rational conscious mind and the proper personal self.

Let us turn now to some points of view in which the two terms or
things are discriminated.

That נֶפֶשׁ and (in the Septuagint) ψυχή should come to stand for
a *dead body*, is a remarkable and startling fact.   But this is explained
by considering that the body is regarded as having been alive; and
that, to the eye, the body represents the *person*.   Indeed, in our ordi-
nary English, we have remarkable traces of a converse usage, viz., of
" body" for person; as anybody, everybody, somebody, nobody, busy-
body, &c.,—terms which we never apply to the lower animals, and which
mean, therefore, not individual bodies, but proper persons.   Besides
we may note the tendency in the vulgar thought and speech in gen-
eral to degrade *person* to *body*, as in the phrases, " He has a fine per-
son", " To adorn the person", " His personal appearance or bearing",
&c.   And thus there is danger that that most refined and elevated
philosophical conception of personality should be by many people

entirely missed, or merged in mere corporeity.   It may be added that, in imitation of Scripture language, we also, in current English, use *soul* for *person* numerically, as " Every soul on board", "more than twenty souls", &c.   In neither of the above mentioned ways is spirit ever used.

On the other hand, the special uses of spirit are:

(1) To indicate the Spirit of God, the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit.

(2) In the Acts of the Apostles frequently, and sometimes else-where, to indicate his miraculous gifts, or with special reference to them; but, in Cor. xii. 4–11, these are emphatically distinguished in their diversity from the one giver.   In 1 Cor. xiv. 12, spiritual gifts are called πνεύματα (in the plural).

(3) To denote devils or demons, "evil or foul spirits"; and good angels, "ministering spirits."

(4) To denote temper, disposition, character; as, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of", (Luke ix. 55); "A meek and quiet spirit", (1 Pet. iii. 4); so "a spirit of meekness", "of love", &c.; and "spirit of your mind."

In none of these senses is soul ever used.

The question now arises, is man's nature in the Scripture regarded as bipartite or tripartite ?

In the first place, the discriminations just mentioned in the Scrip-ture usage of the terms soul and spirit, when compared with the great mass of indiscriminate usage, can hardly be urged as a sufficient ground for regarding soul and spirit as distinct hypostases, as contra-distinguished constituent parts, of man's natural constitution.

In the second place, by our Lord and by the Evangelists, only a two-fold division is recognized;—it is either "soul and body" or "spirit and body."   "Soul and spirit" are never discriminated.   In one case only the two are placed in juxtaposition, and that in Mary's magnificat; where they are in parallelism, and mean the same thing. Such also is the *general* usage of the New Testament writers, St. Paul included.   Our Lord never speaks of "body *and* spirit", but only of "body *and* soul."   He never speaks of the spirit but only of the soul, as *being saved*.

But there remain a few passages in the New Testament which are by many held to teach the doctrine of trichotomy; and thereby, as they think, to lay the foundation for a specifically Christian philos-ophy of human nature.   This doctrine, with various modifications, was maintained by several of the early fathers, and is by some urged as a solvent for almost all anthropological difficulties in theology. The passages relied upon are: 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12; Jude 19;

Jas. iii. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 14, and xv. 44, 45. I believe these are all that are to any purpose as proofs. And now of these in order :—

(*a*) Take first the passage from 1 Thess. v. 23, "Your whole spirit and soul and body." Here I submit that, in Scripture style, such an expression is not to be conceived of as setting forth or implying a philosophical analysis of man's constitution, but rather as a rhetorical fulness of statement for the whole inner and outer man; just as "Thou shalt love God with all thy heart, and with all thy *soul* and with all thy mind," is not to be understood as (with the body) implying a tetratomistic analysis of the constitution of man. And yet the mode of expression in this latter case is stronger for that purpose than in the former for a similar purpose; it points much more emphatically towards a real distinction and separation of parts than the simple phrase, "With all thine heart and soul and mind" (like "whole spirit and soul and body") would have done. To these four (body being included) is, in one case, added a fifth, "and with all thy strength." Does this imply the philosophy of a pentatomistic constitution of man's being? We have just seen that both the Hebrew and the Greek terms for *soul* and *spirit* are used, both in the Old and New Testaments, as, in general, synonomous expressions for that whole living being which, as Butler says, we call ourselves. It is true that, like all so-called synonomous words,—like heart and soul and mind,—they may each have some special modification of meaning and some special proprieties of use and application. But all this is not enough to show that they denote distinct things or beings or objects of thought. We must always beware how we read our modern abstractions and nice metaphysical analyses into the concrete and popular language of Scripture. The argument from ὁλόκληρον (whole) as implying three parts is merely fanciful.

(*b*) Next comes Heb. iv. 12, "The dividing asunder of soul and spirit." This dividing is thought to settle the question as to the real distinction between soul and spirit, by showing that they are not only logically but actually separable. But here, in fact, the whole operation is logical,—an operation by the word of God acting upon functions, and not directly upon entities, and an operation which is described in highly figurative language. In any event, it does not express a dividing asunder of the soul *from* the spirit, but a dividing *of* the soul and a dividing *of* the spirit; for it is plain that the dividing "of the joints and marrow" is not a dividing of the joints *from* the marrow, but a separation of joint from joint or of each joint in twain, and a cleaving asunder of the marrow,—as if by a strong downward stroke of a sword, the whole spine were to be cleft in the

midst. It is plain, too, that the critical discerning or distinguishing "of the thoughts and intents of the heart," is not a discriminating of thoughts from intents but of thought from thought and intent from intent; still less can it reasonably be supposed to imply that thoughts and intents are assumed to be two real and substantial divisions or constituent parts of the heart. If it be suggested that the soul and spirit are absolute units, indivisible entities, and, so, incapable of separation into parts; I answer, that neither the language of Scripture nor the ordinary speech of even these our philosophical and scientific times has anything to do with such nice distinctions. The Scriptures speak, and we speak, of a distracted mind, a divided heart, a wounded and broken spirit. In short, in my view, the text would have much the same sense if it read: "Dividing asunder of heart and soul," &c., or, "Of heart and spirit," &c.

(c) Four passages remain; in all of which the adjective "psychic" or "psychical," (Ψυχικός), is used in opposition to "spiritual" or "pneumatic," (πνευματικός.) St. Jude speaks of certain men as "psychical, not having the spirit." But surely he is not speaking of men who are destitute of a trichotomistic part of the human constitution; but of men who, in their full natural powers, are destitute of the Spirit of God, and so are of a worldly and carnal disposition. In like manner St. James describes certain men as "earthly, psychical, demon-like";—as if he had said, "not having the Spirit of God, but the spirit of evil demons." So also St. Paul, in 1 Cor. ii. 14, represents the "psychical" man as one who is not enlightened and taught by the Spirit of God, in contrast with the spiritual (or pneumatical) man who is so taught. Thus St. Jude furnishes the key, "psychical, not having the Spirit"—not having the Spirit of God.

The passage in 1 Cor. xv. 44 is somewhat different. Here the Apostle speaks of "a psychical *body* and a spiritual (or pneumatical) *body.*" Now, as the psychical man is not a man who is destitute of a third part of man's normal constitution, or of a rational and moral nature, but a man who has not the Spirit of God; he is, while in this natural condition,—while not informed, illumined, energized by the indwelling of the Divine Spirit, worldly, carnal, sensual; and so he is associated in the Apostle's mind with this mortal and corruptible body. And the spiritual (or pneumatic), which the Apostle most commonly sets in an antithesis to the fleshly or carnal (σαρκικός—πνεῦμα to σάρξ)—is thus naturally opposed here to the psychical. The psychical body, then, is that which furnishes the organic connexion with worldly and sensible things, while the spiritual body is that which shall furnish an organic connexion with external things in a

heavenly and spiritual state;—I say, an organic connexion after the analogy of the present body in its relation to the mind or soul. For the spiritual body is *body* and not spirit, and therefore must come under the definition of *body.* If it were to be mere spirit, then every man, in the future state, would have two spirits, the spirit that he had here and another spirit received at the resurrection.

The Spirit of God is not represented as coming into direct contact with the outer man, but first with the inner man, and through that with the outer. And thus the Apostle says: "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in you." And the operation of the Spirit of God upon the inner man, renewing, enlightening, sanctifying; changing the psychical to the pneumatical man; is not represented, and is not to be conceived of, as introducing into its subjects any new substance or faculties or constituent parts of their nature, but as renovating and restoring the deranged and perverted or misdirected functions ; the regenerate man is renewed in the spirit and temper of his mind, renewed in righteousness and true holiness, renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him, created anew in Christ Jesus. Through the power of the Holy Ghost, Christ dwells in his people as a quickening Spirit. It is presumed that man in his original condition, before he sinned, was not destitute of the Spirit. And yet, to illustrate the reality of the psychical body, the Apostle refers to Adam as he was originally created : "And *so* it is written," he says, "the first man Adam was made a living soul." Thus, in his normal original state, he was a psychical man. The ψυχή, ψυχικός, do not, therefore, necessarily carry with them a bad sense; but only when the latter is used in a distinctively negative way, as the Apostle here employs it, so that it implies the destitution of the Divine Spirit.

But now, finally, supposing that the Apostle here or elsewhere would contradistinguish soul and spirit as being distinct and co-ordinate, higher and lower, parts of man's inner nature; I should still maintain that the whole *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures requires us to consider it as a *functional* and not a *substantial* distinction. The twofold distinction into body and soul, body and spirit, body and mind, is to be regarded as a real and substantial distinction; but in the threefold distinction into "body, soul and spirit," that between soul and spirit simply refers to different faculties, relations or activities— functions—of the inner man, who is substantially an individual unit, but whose functions are thus distributed in respect to his moral

and religious state, into two great departments, lower and higher, earthward and heavenward.

Those who scout the idea of substances as a mere metaphysical figment must of course admit the negative proposition, that the distinction in question is not substantial; and it is difficult to see how they can refuse to admit the positive proposition, that it is functional.

On the other hand, those who adopt the idea of substance, as it is commonly understood, must either admit the statement that the distinction in question is not substantial but functional, or they must hold that there are real substances in the world which are neither matter nor mind, and that either the soul or the spirit is such a substance.

I suppose that nobody has ever denied or doubted that in man's inner nature there are higher and lower powers or faculties or functions, and that it is the higher parts that are directly receptive of the impulse of the Divine Spirit. And if this is all that is meant by the trichotomists, they need not make much noise about their discovery. The real difficulty would be to draw any precise line between the higher and the lower, and to distribute all man's faculties or functions (other than the bodily) into the two departments of soul and spirit; and especially to make this distribution *as of Scripture authority* and in consonance with the actual use of these words in the Old and New Testaments, or in either of them. The commonly received and very loose division of man's nature into Intellectual, Moral and Physical does not seem to correspond to what is meant by those who make the threefold division into spirit, soul and body; for they are understood to include the higher—rational as well as moral—faculties under the spirit, while they admit that in great part the moral affections belong to the soul. But we have seen that the same affections belong also to the spirit; and St. Paul enumerates among the fruits of the spirit, "love, joy, peace," &c., and speaks of "your love in the spirit." And if it be suggested that the higher affections belong to the spirit and the lower to the soul, it is remarkable that the very highest of the affections, that which is the foremost of the spiritual graces, the very heart of the highest spiritual life, that which will endure when faith and knowledge shall vanish away—*love*, is a function of the soul. See Isa. xlii. 1, "In whom my soul delighteth"; and Song of Solomon, i. 7 and iii. 1–4, where "my soul loveth" is five times repeated. Here the Septuagist uses the verb $\dot{a} \gamma a \pi \acute{a} \omega$.

The trichotomists are understood to admit that the will belongs to the soul; and certainly the soul is represented as the active, motive

power in man.   But St. Paul "purposed in the spirit" (ἔθετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι).   The conscience might be assigned to the spirit, but it includes a *sentiment* as well as a judgment; and, besides, the soul as the person, the ego,—as it is admitted to be,—must be the subject of the whole consciousness.

The spirit, as we have seen, may be used for the person also; but when the Divine Spirit is said to "witness with our spirits that we are the Sons of God," it does not appear that the sense is anywise different from what it would be if the apostle had said "with our minds," "our hearts," or "our souls."   For the same apostle says that "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts" (not into our spirits); and the Spirit thus imparted begets, or becomes, in us "the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father."

The general conclusion, therefore, is, that :

(1) The words soul and spirit are generally employed in the Scriptures in an indiscriminate way, each as denoting the whole mind or inner man.

(2) In some few cases *spirit* may be used to denote especially the higher faculties or functions of the mind or soul, but even then not in direct contrast with the soul itself.

(3) In some other cases *spirit* is used for what does not at all belong to man in his natural state; but, for a certain temper, disposition and direction of the heart, imparted by the Divine Spirit in the life of Christ, by virtue of which Christians are called spiritual (or pneumatical) men.

But (4) there is no ground in the Scripture use of the words soul and spirit to furnish the foundation for the trichotomistic doctrine of a sharp and radical distinction between the two, as co-ordinate parts of man's nature,—much less as distinct substances in his constitution.

NOTE.—In the second Scripture quotation, p. 74, from Isa. lvii. 16, the original word for "souls" is נְשָׁמוֹת

On the Construction of Romans ix. 5.

BY PROF. EZRA ABBOT, D. D., LL. D., CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

We shall understand better the passage to be discussed if we con-
sider its relation to what precedes and follows, and the circumstances
under which it was written.

In the first eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans the Apostle
has set forth the need and the value of the gospel, as "the power of
God unto salvation to *every one that believeth*; to the Jew first, and
also to the Greek." In view of the present blessings and the glorious
hopes of the Christian believer he closes this part of the Epistle with
an exultant song of triumph.

But the doctrine of Paul was in direct opposition to the strongest
prejudices of the Jews, and their most cherished expectations. It
placed them on a level as to the conditions of salvation with the
despised and hated Gentiles. The true Messiah, the king of Israel,
the spiritual king of men, had come; but the rulers of their nation
had crucified the Lord of glory, and the great mass of the people had
rejected him. They had thus placed themselves in direct opposition
to God; they had become ἀνάθεμα ἀπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ, outcasts from the
Messiah and his kingdom. Christians, a large majority of them
Gentiles by birth, were now the true Israel. No rite of circumcision,
no observance of the Jewish Law was required, as the condition of
acceptance with God, and the enjoyment of the Messianic blessings;
no sacrifice but self-sacrifice: the only condition was *faith*, as Paul
uses the term,—a *practical* belief and trust in Christ, and thus in
God revealed in his paternal character; a faith that carried with it
the affections and will, πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.

How could these things be? How was this gospel of Paul to be
reconciled with the promises of God to the "holy nation"? how with
his justice, wisdom, and goodness? Had God cast off his people,

"Israel his servant, Jacob his chosen, the seed of Abraham his friend"? These are the great questions which the Apostle answers in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of this Epistle. The first five verses are to be regarded as a *conciliatory introduction* to his treatment of this subject, on which he had so much to say that was not only hard for the unbelieving Jews, but for Jewish Christians, to understand and accept.

The unbelieving Jews regarded the Apostle as an apostate from the true religion, and as an enemy of their race. Five times already he had received from them forty stripes save one; he had been "in perils from his own countrymen" at Damascus, at Antioch in Pisidia, at Iconium and Lystra, at Thessalonica, Berœa, and Corinth,—often in peril of his life. By a great part of the believing Jews he was regarded with distrust and aversion. (See Acts xxi. 20, 21.) His doctrines were indeed revolutionary. Though he was about to go to Jerusalem to carry a liberal contribution from the churches of Macedonia and Achaia to the poor Christians in that city, he expresses in this Epistle great anxiety about the reception he should meet with (anxiety fully justified by the result), and begs the prayers of the brethren at Rome in his behalf. (Rom. xv. 30–32.) As the Jews hated Paul, they naturally believed that he hated them.

These circumstances explain the exceedingly strong asseveration of his affection for his countrymen, and of his deep sorrow for their estrangement from God, with which this introduction begins. So far from being an enemy of his people, he could make any sacrifice to win them to Christ. They were his brethren, his kinsmen as to the flesh; he gloried in sharing with them the proud name of Israelite; he delights to enumerate the magnificent privileges by which God had distinguished them from all other nations,—"the adoption, and the glory, and the giving of the Law, the covenants, the temple-service, and the promises"; theirs were the fathers, and from among them, as the crowning distinction of all, the Messiah was born, the supreme gift of God's love and mercy not to the Jews alone, but to all mankind. All God's dealings with his chosen people were designed to prepare the way, and had prepared the way, for this grand consummation. How natural that when, in his rapid recital of their historic glories, the Apostle reaches this highest distinction of the Jews and greatest blessing of God's mercy to men he should express his overflowing gratitude to God as the Ruler over All; that he should "thank God for his unspeakable gift"! I believe that he has done so; and that the fifth verse of the passage we are considering should be translated,—"whose are the fathers, and from whom is the Mes-

siah as to the flesh: he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever.
Amen.," or, "he who is God over all be blessed for ever. Amen."
The doxology springs from the same feeling and the same view of the
gracious providence of God which prompted the fuller outburst at the
end of the eleventh chapter, where, on completing the treatment of
the subject which he here introduces, the Apostle exclaims, "O the
depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God ! How
unsearchable are his judgments and untraceable his ways ! . . .
For from Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things : to
Him be (*or* is) the glory for ever. Amen."

I believe that there are no objections to this construction of the
passage which do not betray their weakness when critically examined;
and that the objections against most of the other constructions which
have been proposed are fatal.

The passage is remarkable for the different ways in which it has
been and may be punctuated, and for the consequent variety of con-
structions which have been given it. The Greek is as follows:

——καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς
εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

It *grammatically* admits of being punctuated and construed in at
least seven different ways.

1. Placing a *comma* after σάρκα, and also after θεός, we may trans-
late the last clause:—"who (*or* he who) is God over all, blessed for
ever."

2. Putting the second comma after πάντων instead of θεός:—"who
(*or* he who) is over all, God blessed for ever."

3. With a comma after πάντων and also after θεός:—"who (*or* he
who) is over all, God, blessed for ever." So Morus, Gess (*Christi
Person und Werk*, II. i. 207 f., Basel, 1878).

4. Placing a comma after ὁ ὢν, and also after θεός:—"He who
is, God over all, blessed for ever."—See Wordsworth's note, which
however is not consistent throughout; and observe the mistransla-
tion at the end of his quotation from Athanasius (*Orat. cont.
Arianos*, i. § 24, p. 338).*

5. Placing a comma after σάρκα, and a *colon* after πάντων, the last
part of the verse may be rendered:—"and from whom is the Mes-
siah as to the flesh, who (*or* he who) is over all: God be blessed for
ever. Amen."

---

*Perhaps I ought to add here as a curiosity a construction proposed
in the *Record* newspaper, in an article copied in *Christian Opinion
and Revisionist* for March 11, 1882, p. 222. The writer would trans-
late: " Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all,
God. Blessed be He for ever! Amen."

6. Placing a *colon* after σάρχα, θεός may be taken as predicate, thus:—"he who is over all is God, blessed for ever"; so Professor B. H. Kennedy, D. D., Canon of Ely; or thus:—"he who was over all being (*literally*, was) God, blessed for ever." So Andrews Norton.

7. With a colon after σάρχα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός may be taken as the subject, and εὐλογητός as predicate, with the ellipsis of εἴη or ἔστιν, making the last part of the verse a doxology, thus:—"he who is over all, God, be blessed (*or* is to be praised) for ever"; or, "he who is God over all be blessed (*or* is to be praised) for ever"; or, "God, who is over all, be blessed (*or* is to be praised) for ever."

I pass over other varieties of translation and interpretation, depending on the question whether πάντων is to be taken as masculine or neuter, and on the wider or narrower application of the word in either case.

In Nos. 1–4 inclusive, it will be seen that the ὁ ὢν with all that follows, including the designation θεός, is referred to ὁ χριστός; in Nos. 6 and 7, ὁ ὢν introduces an independent sentence, and θεός denotes God, the Father. No. 5 refers the first part of the sentence in debate to ὁ χριστός, the last part to God.

The question of chief interest is whether in this passage the Apostle has called Christ *God.* Among those who hold that he has done so, the great majority adopt one or the other of the constructions numbered 1 and 2; and it is to these, and especially to No. 2, followed both in King James's version and the Revised Version (text), that I shall give special attention. Among those who refer the last part of the sentence to God and not Christ, the great majority of scholars adopt either No. 5 or No. 7. I have already expressed my preference for the latter construction, and it is generally preferred by those who find here a doxology to God.

I. WE will first consider the objections that have been urged against the construction which makes the last part of the sentence, beginning with ὁ ὢν, introduce a doxology to God. I shall then state the arguments which seem to me to favor this construction, and at the same time to render the constructions numbered 1 to 4 each and all untenable. Other views of the passage will be briefly noticed. Some remarks will be added on the history of its interpretation, though no full account of this will be attempted.

1. It is objected that a doxology here is wholly out of place; that the Apostle is overwhelmed with grief at the Jewish rejection of the Messiah and its consequences, and "an elegy or funeral discourse cannot be changed abruptly into a hymn."—He is indeed deeply

grieved at the unbelief and blindness of the great majority of his countrymen; but his sorrow is not hopeless. He knows all the while that "the word of God hath not failed;" that "God hath not cast off his people whom he foreknew"; that at last "all Israel shall be saved"; and nothing seems to me more natural than the play of mingled feelings which the passage presents; grief for the present temporary alienation of his countrymen from Christ; joy and thanksgiving at the thought of the priceless blessings of which Christ was the minister to man, and in which his countrymen should ultimately share.

Flatt, Stuart, and others put the objection in a very pointed form. They represent a doxology as making Paul say, in effect: "The special privileges of the Jews have contributed greatly to enhance the guilt and punishment of the Jewish nation; God be thanked that he has given them such privileges!"—But they simply read into the passage what is not there. There is nothing in the context to suggest that the Apostle is taking this view of the favor which God had shown the Jewish nation. He is not denouncing his countrymen for their guilt in rejecting the Messiah, and telling them that this guilt and its punishment are aggravated by the privileges they have abused. So tender is he of their feelings that he does not even name the cause of his grief, but leaves it to be inferred. He is assuring his countrymen, who regarded him as their enemy, of the sincerity and strength of his love for them. They are his brethren; the very name "Israelite" is to him a title of honor;* and he recounts in detail, certainly not in the manner of one touching a painful subject, the glorious distinctions which their nation had enjoyed through the favor of God. Calvin, who so often in his commentaries admirably traces the connection of thought, here hits the nail on the head: "Haec dignitatis elogia *testimonia sunt amoris.* Non enim solemus adeo benigne loqui, nisi de iis quos amamus."†

At the risk of being tedious, I will take some notice of Dr. Gifford's remarks in his recent and valuable Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. He says: "Paul's anguish is deepened by the memory of their privileges, most of all by the thought that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour, whom they have rejected."—But in Paul's

---

*See ch. xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22.

†The view which I have taken accords with that of Dr. Hodge. He says:—"The object of the Apostle in the introduction to this chapter, contained in the first five verses, is to assure the Jews of his love and of his respect for their peculiar privileges."—*Comm. on the Ep. to the Romans,* new ed. (1864), note on ix. 4, p. 469; see also p. 463.

enumeration of the privileges of the Jews he has in view not merely their present condition but their whole past history, illuminated as it had been by light from heaven.   Will it be seriously maintained that Paul did not regard the peculiar privileges which the Jewish nation had enjoyed for so many ages, as gifts of God's goodness for which eternal gratitude was due?—But "his anguish was deepened most of all by the thought that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour"!   Paul's grief for his unbelieving countrymen, then, had extinguished his gratitude for the inestimable blessings which he personally owed to Christ; it had extinguished his gratitude for the fact that the God who rules over all had sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world !   The dark cloud which hid the light just then from the mass of his countrymen, but which he believed was soon to pass away, had blotted the sun from the heavens.   The advent of Christ was no cause for thanksgiving; he could only bow his head in anguish, deepened most of all by the thought that the Messiah had sprung from the race to which he himself belonged !

"His anguish was deepened by the memory of their privileges." Paul does not say this; and is Dr. Gifford quite sure that this was the way in which these privileges presented themselves to his mind? May we not as naturally suppose that the thought of God's favor to his people in the past, whom he had so often recalled from their wanderings, afforded some ground for the hope that they had not stumbled so as to fall and perish, but that their present alienation from Christ, contributing as it had done, in the overruling providence of God, to the wider and more rapid spread of the gospel among the Gentiles, was only temporary ?   If we will let Paul be his own interpreter, instead of reading unnatural thoughts between his lines, we shall take this view.   "God hath *not* cast off HIS PEOPLE, whom he foreknew," "whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the promises."   "A hardening in part hath befallen Israel," but only " until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so (*or* then) all Israel shall be saved."   It is not for nothing that "theirs are the fathers"; that they had such ancestors as Abraham, "the friend of God," and Isaac, and Jacob; "as touching the gospel, they are enemies for the sake of the Gentiles, but as touching the election," as the chosen people of God, "they are beloved for the fathers' sake." "If the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump; and if the root is holy, so are the branches."   "God doth not repent of his calling and his gifts."   "God hath shut up all [Jews and Gentiles] unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all."   For the ancient prophecy is now fulfilled; the Deliverer hath come out of Zion, and "he shall

turn away ungodliness from Jacob." "O the depth of the riches," &c. Such were the thoughts which the past privileges of the Jews, in connection with the advent of Christ, as we see from the eleventh chapter of this Epistle, *actually* suggested to the mind of Paul.*

Can we then reasonably say, that when in his grand historic survey and enumeration of the distinctive privileges of the Jews, the Apostle reaches the culminating point in the advent of the Messiah, sprung from that race, a devout thanksgiving to God as the beneficent ruler over all is wholly out of place? Might we not rather ask, How could it be repressed?

We may then, I conceive, dismiss the *psychological* objection to the doxology, on which many have laid great stress, as founded on a narrow and superficial view of what we may reasonably suppose to have been in the Apostle's mind. And I am happy to see that so fair-minded and clear-sighted a scholar as Professor Dwight takes essentially the same view of the matter. (See above, p. 41.)

2. A second objection to a doxology here is founded on the relation of the first five verses of the chapter to what follows. A doxology, it is thought, unnaturally breaks the connection between the sixth verse and what precedes.

This argument is rarely adduced, and I should hardly have thought it worthy of notice were it not that Dr. Dwight seems to attach some weight to it, though apparently not much. (See above, p. 41 f.)

The first five verses of the chapter, as we have seen, are a conciliatory introduction to the treatment of a delicate and many-sided subject. This treatment begins with the sixth verse, which is introduced by the particle δέ, "but." Whether the last part of verse 5 is a doxology to God, or simply the climax of the privileges of the Jews, the δέ cannot refer to what *immediately* precedes. In either case, it refers to what is implied in verses 2 and 3, and meets the most prominent objection to the doctrine set forth by the Apostle in the preceding part of the Epistle. The thought is, The present condition of the great mass of my countrymen is indeed a sad one, and not the Jews as a nation, but Christians, are the true people of God; *but* it is not as if the promises of God have failed. (Comp. iii. 3, 4.) This simple statement of the connection of ver. 6 with what precedes seems to me all that is needed to meet the objection. The argument that a

---

* This appreciative recapitulation of the distinctions of the Jewish people would also serve to check the tendency of the Gentile Christians to self-conceit, and would lead them to recognize the important part of the despised Hebrews in the drama of the world's history. It would virtually say to them, "Glory not over the branches; but if thou gloriest, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." (Rom. xi. 18.)

doxology is inconsistent with the Apostle's state of mind has already been answered.

3. A third objection, urged by many, is founded on the alleged abruptness of the doxology, and the absence of any mention of God in what precedes. Some also think that a doxology here would need to be introduced by the particle δέ.

I cannot regard this objection as having any force. It is quite in accordance with the habit of Paul thus to turn aside suddenly to give expression to his feelings of adoration and gratitude toward God.* See Rom. i. 25; vii. 25 (where the genuineness of δέ is very doubtful); 2 Cor. ix. 15, where note the omission of δέ in the genuine text; 1 Tim. i. 17, where the doxology is suggested by the mention of Christ. The doxology xi. 36, as has already been noticed (p. 89), is completely parallel in thought. Far more abrupt is the doxology 2 Cor. xi. 31, ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οἶδεν, ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι, where the ascription of praise is interposed between οἶδεν and ὅτι in an extraordinary manner.

It is very strange that it should be urged as an argument against the doxology that God is not *mentioned* in the preceding context. The name does not occur, but almost every word in verses 4 and 5 suggests the thought of God. So, to a Jew, the very name "Israelites"; so "the adoption, and the glory, and the giving of the Law, and the covenants, and the service, and the promises"; and so above all ὁ χριστός, the Anointed of God, the Messiah; as to the flesh, sprung from the Jews, but as to his holy spirit the Son of God, the messenger of God's love and mercy, not to the Jews alone, but to all the nations of the earth.

That the mention of Christ in such a connection as this should bring vividly to the mind of the Apostle the thought of GOD and his goodness, and thus lead to a doxology, is simply in accordance with the conception of the relation of Christ to God which appears everywhere in this Epistle and in all his Epistles. While Christ, δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα, is the medium of communication of our spiritual blessings, Paul constantly views them in relation to God, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, as the original Author and Source. The gospel is "the gospel of God,"

---

* "Ad hæc annotatum est hoc in scriptis beati Pauli, quod aliquoties in medio sermonis cursu veluti raptus orat, aut adorat, aut gratias agit, aut glorificat Deum, præsertim ubi commemoratum est aliquid de mysteriis adorandis, aut ineffabili bonitate Dei."—Erasmus, *Apol. adv. monachos quosdam Hispanos,* Opp. ix. (Lugd. Bat. 1706), col. 1044. On this subject, and on the position of εὐλογητός, see the valuable note of the Rev. Joseph Agar Beet, *Comm. on St. Paul's Ep. to the Romans,* 2d ed. (Lond. 1881), p. 269 f., 271.

"a power of God unto salvation"; the righteousness which it reveals is "a righteousness which is of God"; it is God who has set forth Christ as ἱλαστήριον, who "commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us"; who "spared not his own Son, but freely gave him for us all"; it is "God who raised him from the dead"; "what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and on account of sin," has done ; the glory to which Christians are destined, as sons and heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ, is "the glory of God"; in short, "all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself through Jesus Christ," and "nothing shall separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Though no one can doubt that Paul was full of love and gratitude to Christ, so that we might expect frequent ascriptions to him of praise and glory, it is a remarkable fact that there *is* no doxology or thanksgiving to Christ in any of his Epistles except those to Timothy, the genuineness of which has been questioned by many modern scholars. These Epistles, at any rate, present marked peculiarities of style and language, and if written by Paul, were probably written near the close of his life.   And in them there is but one doxology to Christ, and that not absolutely certain, on account of the ambiguity of the word κύριος (2 Tim. iv. 18); while the thanksgiving is a simple expression of thankfulness (1 Tim. i. 12), χάριν ἔχω, *gratias habeo* (not *ago*).   One reason for this general absence of such ascriptions to Christ on the part of the Apostle seems to have been that habit of mind of which I have just spoken, and which makes it *a priori* more probable that the doxology in Rom. ix. 5 belongs to God.   But this is a matter which will be more appropriately treated in another place.

As to the δέ, which Schultz insists would be necessary,* one needs only to look fairly at the passage to see that it would be wholly out of place; that a doxology to God involves no *antithetic* contrast between God and Christ, as Schultz and some others strangely imagine.   Nor does δέ as a particle of transition seem natural here, much less required.   It would make the doxology too formal.

4. It is urged that "ὁ ὤν, grammatically considered, is more easily and naturally construed in connection with χριστός, than as the subject of a new and doxological clause."   (See Dr. Dwight's article, pp. 24, 25, above.)

Much stronger language than this is often used.   Dr. Hodge, for

---

* *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.*, 1868, xiii. 470 f., 477.

example, assuming that ὁ ὤν must be equivalent to ὅς ἐστι, says that
the interpretation which refers the words to Christ is the only one
"which can, with the least regard to the rules of construction, be
maintained." (*Comm.* in loc., p. 472.)

Dr. Dwight, whose article is in general so admirable for the fair-
ness, clearness, and moderation of its statements, has expressed him-
self here in such a way that I cannot feel perfectly sure of his meaning.
He says, speaking of the connection of ὁ ὤν with ὁ χριστός, "This
construction of ὁ ὤν, in cases similar to that which is here presented,
is the almost universal one both in the New Testament and in other
Greek."—If "cases similar to that which is here presented" means
cases in which ὁ ὤν (or any participle with the article) is preceded by
a noun to which it may be easily joined, while it also admits of being
regarded as the subject of an independent sentence, and it is affirmed
that in such grammatically ambiguous cases it almost invariably *does*
refer to the preceding subject, the argument is weighty, if the asser-
tion is true.   But not even *one* such case has ever, to my knowledge,
been pointed out.   Till such a case, or rather a sufficient number of
such cases to serve as the basis of a reasonable induction, shall be
produced, I am compelled to consider the statement as resting on no
evidence whatever.   Yet that this is what is meant by "similar cases"
seems necessarily to follow from what is said further on (p. 24) about
"the peculiarity of Rom. ix. 5."   Cases in which ὁ ὤν, grammati-
cally considered, *can* only refer to a preceding subject, are certainly
not "similar cases to that which is here presented," in which, as Dr.
Dwight admits, "there is, at the most, only a presumption in favor
of this construction of the clause as against the other" (p. 25).

But if Dr. Dwight's statement means, or is intended to imply, that
ὁ ὤν with its adjuncts, or, in general, the participle with the article,
almost universally forms a descriptive or a limiting clause referring to
a preceding subject, while its use as the independent subject of a
sentence is rare, the assertion is fatally incorrect.   The latter use is
not only very common, but in the New Testament, at least, is more
frequent than the former.   We have (*a*) ὁ ὤν, or οἱ ὄντες, in the
nominative, as the subject of an independent sentence, Matt. xii. 30;
Mark xiii. 16 (text. rec.); Luke vi. 3 (t. r., Tisch.); xi. 23; John iii.
31; vi. 46; viii. 47; ix. 40; Acts xxii. 9; Rom. viii. 5, 8.   *Contra*
(*b*), referring to a preceding subject, and forming, as I understand it,
an *appositional* clause, John i. 18; iii. 13 (text. rec.); (Acts v. 17;)
2 Cor. xi. 31; Rev. v. 5 (t. r.); a *limiting* clause, John xi. 31; xii.
17; Acts xi. 1.   To these may be added 2 Cor. v. 4; Eph. ii. 13,
where the clause is in apposition with or describes ἡμεῖς or ὑμεῖς

expressed or understood; and perhaps John xviii. 37 ($\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{o}\ \mathring{\omega}\nu\ \varkappa.$ $\tau.\ \lambda.$).*

It is uncertain whether Col. iv. 11 belongs under (a) or (b); see Meyer *in loc.* For the examples of $\mathring{\omega}\nu$ I have relied on Bruder's Concordance, p. 255, No. VI. But as there is nothing peculiar in the use of this particular participle with the article, so far as the present question is concerned, I have, with the aid of Bruder,† examined the occurrences of the participle in general, in the nominative, with the article, in the Gospel of Matthew, the Epistle to the Romans, and the First Epistle to the Corinthians. I find in Matthew 86 examples of its use (a) as the subject, or in a very few cases (9) as the predicate, of a verb expressed or understood, and only 38 of its use (b) in a descriptive or limiting clause, annexed to a preceding subject; in the Epistle to the Romans 28 examples of the former kind against 12 of the latter; and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians 39 of the former against 4 of the latter, one of these being a false reading.‡

In general, it is clear that the use of the participle with the article, as the subject of an independent sentence, instead of being exceptional in the New Testament, is far more common than its use as an attributive. Nor is this strange; for $\acute{o}\ \mathring{\omega}\nu$ properly signifies not "who is," but "he who is." The force of the article is not lost.§ While

---

*The examples of $\acute{o}\ \mathring{\omega}\nu$ and other participles with $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ belong perhaps quite as properly under (a). Without $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$, the $\acute{o}\ \mathring{\omega}\nu\ \varkappa.\ \tau.\ \lambda.$ is the subject of the sentence, and the meaning is the same; $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ only strengthens the $\acute{o}\ \mathring{\omega}\nu$. See Krüger, *Gr. Sprachlehre*, 5te Aufl. (1875), § 50. 4. Anm. 1.

†*Concordantiae*, etc., p. 586, No. 2; p. 598, No. VII. 1; comp. p. 603, No. VIII.; 604, No. IX.

‡In this reckoning, to prevent any cavil, I have included under (b) all the examples of $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{o}$ or $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\varepsilon\varsigma\ o\acute{\iota}$, of which there are 8 in Matthew, 2 in Romans, and 1 in 1 Cor.; also the cases of the article and participle with $\sigma\acute{v}$ or $\acute{v}\mu\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ as the subject of the verb, expressed or understood, of which there are 4 in Matthew and 7 in Romans. I have not counted on either side Rom. viii. 33, 34, and ix. 33; the first two, translated according to the text of the Revised Version, belong under (a), according to its margin, under (b); Rom. ix. 33, if we omit $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$, with all the critical editors, would also belong under (a).

§"Participles take the article only when some relation already known or especially noteworthy (*is qui, quippe qui*) is indicated, and consequently the idea expressed by the participle is to be made more prominent."—Winer, *Gram.* 7te Aufl., § 20, 1. b. *a.* c. p. 127 (p. 134 Thayer).

in some of its uses it may seem interchangeable with ὅς ἐστι, it dif-
fers in this, that it is generally employed either in appositional or in
limiting clauses, in distinction from descriptive or additive clauses,
while ὅς with the finite verb is appropriate for the latter. For
examples of the former, see John i. 18; xii. 17; of the latter, Rom.
v. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 4. To illustrate the difference by the passage
before us: if ὁ ὤν here refers to ὁ χριστός, the clause would be more
exactly translated as appositional, not "*who is*," &c., but "*he who
is God over all*, blessed for ever," implying that he was well known
to the readers of the Epistle as God, or at least marking this predicate
with special emphasis; while ὅς ἐστιν would be more appropriate if it
were simply the purpose of the Apostle to predicate deity of Christ,
and would also be perfectly unambiguous.

There is nothing, then, either in the proper meaning of ὁ ὤν, or in
its usage, which makes it more easy and natural to refer it to
ὁ χριστός, than to take it as introducing an independent sentence.
It is next to be observed, that there are circumstances which make
the latter construction easy, and which distinguish the passage from
nearly all others in which ὁ ὤν, or a participle with the article, is
used as an attributive. In all the other instances in the New Testament
of this use of ὁ ὤν or οἱ ὄντες in the nominative, with the single excep-
tion of the parenthetic insertion in 2 Cor. xi. 31 (see above, page 94),
it *immediately* follows the subject to which it relates. The same is
generally true of other examples of the participle with the article.
(The strongest cases of exception which I have noticed are John vii.
50 and 2 John 7.) But here ὁ ὤν is separated from ὁ χριστός by
τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, which in reading *must* be followed by a pause, a pause
which is lengthened by the special emphasis given to the κατὰ σάρκα
by the τό;* and the sentence which precedes is complete in itself
grammatically, and requires nothing further logically, for it was only
as to the flesh that Christ was from the Jews. On the other hand,
as we have seen (p. 88) the enumeration of blessings which imme-

---

* If ὁ χριστός were placed *after* κατὰ σάρκα, the ambiguity would not
indeed be wholly removed, but it would be much more natural to refer
the ὁ ὤν to Christ than it is now. Perhaps the feeling of this led Cyril
of Alexandria to make this transposition, as he does in quoting the passage
against the Emperor Julian, who maintained that "neither Paul dared to
call Christ God, nor Matthew, nor Luke, nor Mark, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ χρηστὸς
Ἰωάννης." (See Cyril *cont. Julian.* lib. x. *Opp.* vi. b. p. 328 b ed. Aubert.)
In two other instances Cyril quotes the passage in the same way; *Opp.*
v. b. pp. 118 a, 148 e; though he usually follows the order of the present
Greek text.

diately precedes, crowned by the inestimable blessing of the advent
of Christ, naturally suggests an ascription of praise and thanksgiving
to God as the Being who rules over all; while a doxology is also
suggested by the 'Ἀμήν at the end of the sentence.* From every
point of view, therefore, the doxological construction seems easy and
natural. The ellipsis of the verb ἔστι or εἴη in such cases is simply
according to rule. The construction numbered 6 above (see p. 90)
is also perfectly easy and natural grammatically; see 2 Cor. i. 21;
v. 5; Heb. iii. 4.

The naturalness of a pause after σάρκα is further indicated by the
fact that we find a point after this word in all our oldest MSS. that
testify in the case, namely, A B C L, and in at least eight cursives,
though the cursives have been rarely examined with reference to their
punctuation. †

It has been urged (see above, p. 24), that if the writer did not
intend that ὁ ὤν should be referred to Christ, he would have adopted
another construction for his sentence, which would be exposed to no
such misapprehension. But this argument is a boomerang. Mr.
Beet in his recent Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (2d
ed., p. 271 f.) well says, on the other hand:—

"Had Paul thought fit to deviate from his otherwise unvarying
custom and to speak of Christ as *God*, he must have done so with a
serious and set purpose of asserting the divinity of Christ. And if so,
he would have used words which no one could misunderstand. In a
similar case, John i. 1, we find language which excludes all doubt.
And in this case the words ὅς ἐστιν, as in i. 25, would have. given
equal certainty . . . Moreover, here Paul has in hand an altogether
different subject, the present position of the Jews. And it seems to
me much more likely that he would deviate from his common mode
of expression, and write once 'God be blessed' instead of 'to God
be glory,' than that in a passage which does not specially refer to the
nature of Christ, he would assert, what he nowhere else explicitly

---

* In 15 out of the 18 instances in the N. T., besides the present, in
which 'Ἀμήν at the end of a sentence is probably genuine, it follows a
doxology; viz.: Rom. i. 25; xi. 36; xvi. 27; Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 21; Phil.
iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17; vi. 16; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11;
v. 11; (2 Pet. iii. 18.) Jude 25; Rev. i. 6; vii. 12.—*Contra*, Rom. xv. 33;
Gal. vi. 18; (Rev. i. 7.)

† The MSS. ℵ D F G cannot be counted on one side or the other; respect-
ing K we have no information. For a fuller statement of the facts in
the case, see Note A at the end of this article.

asserts, that Christ is God, and assert it in language which may
either mean this or something quite different."

Many writers, like Dr. Gifford, speak of that construction which
refers ὁ ὤν &c., to Christ as "the natural and simple" one, "which
every Greek scholar would adopt without hesitation, if no doctrine
were involved."—It might be said in reply, that the natural and
simple construction of words considered apart from the doctrine it
involves, and with reference to merely lexical and grammatical con-
siderations, is by no means always the true one. For example,
according to the natural construction of the words ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς
τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστε (John viii. 44), their meaning is, "you are from
the father of the devil," and probably no Greek scholar would think
of putting any other meaning on them, if no question of doctrine
were involved.   Again, in Luke ii. 38, "she gave thanks unto God,
and spake of him to all them that were looking for the redemption of
Jerusalem," how unnatural, it may be said, to refer the "him" to
any subject but "God," there being no other possible antecedent
mentioned in this or in the three preceding verses! But I do not
make or need to make this reply.   We have already considered the
grammatical side of the question, and have seen, I trust, that the
construction which makes ὁ ὤν &c. the subject of a new sentence is
perfectly simple and easy. I only add here that the meaning of
words often depends on the way they are read; on the pauses, and
tones of voice. (If we could only have heard Paul dictate this pas-
sage to Tertius!) And it is a matter of course, that when a person has
long been accustomed, from whatever cause, to read and understand
a passage in a particular way, any other mode of reading it will seem
to him unnatural. But this impression will often be delusive. And
it does not follow, that a mode of understanding the passage which
was easy and natural in the third and fourth centuries, or even earlier,
when it had become common to apply the name θεός to Christ, would
have seemed the most easy and natural to the first readers of the
Epistle.   I waive here all considerations of doctrine, and call atten-
tion only to the use of language.   When we observe that everywhere
else in this Epistle the Apostle has used the word θεός of the Father
in distinction from Christ, so that it is virtually a proper name; that
this is also true of the Epistles previously written, those to the Thes-
salonians, Galatians, Corinthians; how can we reasonably doubt that
if the verbal ambiguity here occasioned a momentary hesitation as to
the meaning, a primitive reader of the Epistle would naturally sup-
pose that the word θεός designated the being everywhere else denoted
by this name in the Apostle's writings, and would give the passage

the construction thus suggested? But this is a point which will be considered more fully in another place.

The objection that, if we make the last clause a doxology to God, "the participle ὤν is superfluous and awkward," will be noticed below under No. 6.

5. It is further urged that τὸ κατὰ σάρκα requires an antithesis, which is supposed to be supplied by what follows. Some even say that κατὰ σάρκα must mean "according to his human nature," and therefore requires as an antithesis the mention of the divine nature of Christ. But the proper antithesis to κατὰ σάρκα is κατὰ πνεῦμα, not κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, which there is nothing in the phrase itself to suggest: κατὰ σάρκα, as will at once appear on examining the cases of its use in the New Testament, does not refer to a distinction of *natures*, but often denotes a physical relation, such for example as depends on birth or other outward circumstances, in contrast with a spiritual relation. We need only refer to the 3d verse of this very chapter, which certainly does not imply that Paul or his "kinsmen κατὰ σάρκα" had a divine nature also. The phrase κατὰ σάρκα undoubtedly implies an antithesis; "as to the flesh," by his natural birth and in his merely outward relations the Messiah, the Son of David, was from the Jews, and in this they might glory; but as Son of God and in his higher, spiritual relations, he belonged to all mankind. It was not to the Apostle's purpose to describe what he was κατὰ πνεῦμα, as he is speaking of the *peculiar* distinctions of the Jews. Indeed, the antithesis to κατὰ σάρκα is very often not expressed; see, for example, Rom. iv. 1; ix. 3; 1 Cor. i. 26; x. 18; 2 Cor. v. 16; Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22; so that Alford judiciously says: "I do not reckon among the objections the want of any antithesis to κατὰ σάρκα, because that might have well been left to the readers to supply." We have an example strikingly parallel to the present in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (c. 32), first adduced so far as I know by Dr. Whitby in his *Last Thoughts*, which at least demonstrates that in a case like this the expression of an antithesis is not required. Speaking of the high distinctions of the patriarch Jacob, Clement says: "For from him were all the·priests and Levites that ministered to the altar of God; from him was the Lord Jesus *as to the flesh* (τὸ κατὰ σάρκα); from him were kings and rulers and leaders in the line of Judah."

The eminent Dutch commentator, Van Hengel, maintains in an elaborate note on this passage, citing many examples, that the form of the restrictive phrase here used, τ ὸ κατὰ σάρκα, with the neuter article prefixed, absolutely requires a pause after σάρκα, and does not admit, according to Greek usage, of the *expression* of an antithesis

after it, so that the following part of the verse must be referred to
God. (Comp. Rom. i. 15; xii. 18.) He represents his view as sup-
ported by the authority of the very distinguished Professor C. G.
Cobet of Leyden, who as a master of the Greek language has perhaps
no superior among European scholars.[*]

It may be true that Greek usage in respect to such restrictive
expressions, when τό or τά is prefixed, accords with the statement of
Van Hengel, endorsed by Cobet. In my limited research I have
found no exception. The two passages cited by Meyer in opposition
(see above, p. 27) seem to me wholly irrelevant; the former, because
we have μέν with the τὸ ἐπ᾽ ἐμοί, which of course requires an anti-
thetic clause with δέ; the latter, because the essential element in the
case, the τό or τά, does not stand before κατὰ τὸ ἄστυ. But I must
agree with Dr. Dwight (p. 28) that Van Hengel's argument is not
conclusive. On the supposition that ὁ ὤν, &c., refers to Christ, we
have not a formal antithesis, such as would be excluded by Van
Hengel's rule, but simply an appositional, descriptive clause, setting
forth the exalted dignity of him who as to the flesh sprang from the
Jews. I cannot believe that there is any law of the Greek language
which forbids this.

We may say, however, and it is a remark of some importance, that
the τό before κατὰ σάρκα, laying stress on the restriction, and suggest-
ing an antithesis which therefore did not need to be expressed, indi-
cates that the writer has done with that point, and makes a pause
natural; it makes it easy to take the ὁ ὤν as introducing an indepen-
dent sentence, though it does not, as I believe, make it necessary to
take it so.

I admit further, that if we assume that the conception of Christ as
God was familiar to the readers of the Epistle, and especially if we
suppose that they had often heard him called so by the early preach-
ers of Christianity, the application of the ὁ ὤν, &c., to Christ here
would be natural, and also very suitable to the object of the Apostle
in this passage. I am obliged to say, however, that this is assuming
what is not favored by Paul's use of language, or by the record of the
apostolic preaching in the book of Acts.

On the other hand, there was no need of such an appendage to
ὁ χριστός. We have only to consider the glory and dignity with

---

[*] See Van Hengel, *Interp. Ep. Pauli ad Rom.* tom. ii. (1859), pp. 348–
353, and pp. 804–813. Speaking of his citations, he says (p. 350),
"Allatorum unum alterumque mecum communicavit COBETIUS noster,
se multo plura, quibus interpretatio mea confirmaretur, suppeditare
posse dicens."

which the name of the Messiah was invested in the mind of a Jew, and the still higher glory and dignity associated with ὁ χριστός in the mind of a Christian, and especially in the mind of Paul.

6. It is further objected that in sentences which begin with a doxology or an ascription of blessing εὐλογητός (or εὐλογημένος) always precedes the subject; and that "the laws" or "rules of grammar" (Stuart, Alford) require that it should do so here to justify the construction proposed. So in the N. T. εὐλογητός stands first in the doxologies Luke i. 68; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3; and so εὐλογητός and εὐλογημένος precede the subject in a multitude of places in the Septuagint. (See Tromm's Concordance, and Wahl's *Clavis librorum Vet. Test. apocryphorum.*)

Great stress has been laid on this objection by many; but I believe that a critical examination will show that it has no real weight.

We will begin by considering a misconception of the meaning of ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός which has led to untenable objections against the doxological construction, and has prevented the reason for the position of εὐλογητός from being clearly seen. It has been assumed by many that the phrase is simply equivalent to "the Supreme God" (so Wahl, *s. v. ἐπί, omnibus superior, omnium summus*)*, as if the Apostle was contrasting God with Christ in respect to dignity, instead of simply describing God as the being who rules over all. This misunderstanding of the expression occasioned the chief difficulty felt by De Wette in adopting the construction which places a colon or a period after σάρκα; it seemed to him like "throwing Christ right into the shade," without any special reason, when we should rather expect something said in antithesis to τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, to set forth his dignity; though he admits that this objection is removed, if we accept Fritzsche's explanation of the passage.† On this false view is founded Schultz's notion (see above, p. 95) that δέ would be needed here to indicate the antithesis. On it is also grounded the objection of Alford, Farrar,

---

* Wahl gives a more correct view of the use of ἐπί in his *Clavis libr. Vet. Test. apocr.* (1853), p. 218, col. 1, C. b., where εἰμὶ ἐπί with the genitive is defined, *praesum alicui rei, moderor* s. *administro aliquam rem.* Comp. Grimm's *Lexicon Gr.-Lat. in libros N. T.*, ed. 2da, *s. v. ἐπί,* A. 1. d. p. 160, col. 2; Rost and Palm's Passow, vol. i. p. 1035, col. 1, 3; and the references given by Meyer and Van Hengel *in loc.* See Acts viii. 27; xii. 20; Gen. xliv. 1; Judith xiv. 13, εἶπαν τῷ ὄντι ἐπὶ πάντων αὐτοῦ.

† De Wette, *Kurze Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer*, 4te Aufl. (1847), p. 130.

and others, that the ὤν is "perfectly superfluous," as indeed it would
be, if that were simply the meaning intended. To express the idea
of "the God over all," "the Supreme God," in contrast with a
being to whom the term "God" might indeed be applied, but only
in a lower sense, we should need only ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, a phrase
which is thus used numberless times in the writings of the Christian
Fathers; see, for examples, Wetstein's note on Rom. ix. 5. But, as
I understand the passage, the ὤν is by no means superfluous. It not
only gives an impressive fulness to the expression, but converts what
would otherwise be a mere epithet of God into a *substantive* designa-
tion of him, equivalent to "the Ruler over All," on which the mind
rests for a moment by itself, before it reaches the θεός qualified by it;
or θεός *may* be regarded as added by way of apposition or more pre-
cise definition. The *position* of this substantive designation of θεός,
between the article and its noun, gives it special prominence.
Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 7, οὔτε ὁ φυτεύων ἐστί τι, οὔτε ὁ ποτίζων, ἀλλ᾿ ὁ
αὐξάνων θεός; Addit. ad Esth. viii. l. 39, ὁ τὰ πάντα δυναστεύων θεός,
cf. ll. 8, 35, Tisch.; ὁ πάντων δεσπόζων θεός, Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 15;
ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς θεός, *ibid.* i. 26. In expressions of this kind
the definite article fulfils, I conceive, a double function: it is con-
nected with the participle or other adjunct which immediately follows
it, just as it would be if the substantive at the end were omitted; but
at the same time it makes that substantive definite, so that the
article in effect belongs to the substantive as well as to the participle.
Thus ὁ ὤν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός is equivalent to ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὤν ἐπὶ πάντων in
everything except the difference in *prominence* given to the different
parts of the phrase in the two expressions. In the latter, ὁ θεός is
made prominent by its position; in the former, prominence is given
to the particular conception expressed by ὁ ὤν ἐπὶ πάντων, "the
Ruler over All."*

Let us look now for a moment at the connection of thought in the
passage before us, and we shall see that this distinction is important.
The Apostle is speaking of the favored nation to which it is his pride
to belong. Its grand religious history of some two thousand years

---

*If this account is correct it follows that neither of the renderings
which I have suggested above (p. 89) as expressing my view of the
meaning represents the original perfectly; nor do I perceive that the
English idiom admits of a perfect translation. If we render, "he who is
over all, God, be blessed for ever," we make the word "God" stand in
simple apposition to "he who is over all," which I do not suppose to be
the *grammatical* construction; if on the other hand we translate, "he
who is God over all be blessed for ever," we lose in a great measure the
effect of the position of the ὤν ἐπὶ πάντων before θεός.

passes rapidly before his mind as in a panorama. Their ancestors were the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; theirs were "the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the temple-service, and the promises." But God's choice and training of his "peculiar people," and the privileges conferred upon them, were all a providential preparation for the advent of the Messiah, whose birth from among the Jews was their highest national distinction and glory, while his mission as the founder of a spiritual and *universal* religion was the crowning manifestation of God's love and mercy to mankind. How could this survey of the ages of promise and preparation, and the great fulfilment in Christ, fail to bring vividly before the mind of the Apostle the thought of God as *the Being who presides over all things*,—who cares for all men and controls all events?* Because this conception is prominent in his mind he places the ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων first in the sentence. A recognition of this fact removes all the difficulty about the position of εὐλογητός. There is no "law of grammar" bearing on the matter except the law that the predicate, when it is more prominent in the mind of the writer, precedes the subject. In simply exclamatory doxologies, the εὐλογητός or εὐλογημένος comes first, because the feeling that prompts its use is predominant, and can be expressed in a single word. But here, where the thought of the overruling providence of God is prominent, the ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων *must* stand first in the sentence, to express

---

*Erasmus has well presented the thought of the Apostle:—" Ut enim haec omnia, quae commemorat de adoptione, gloria, testamentis, legislatione, cultibus, ac promissis, deque patribus, ex quibus Christus juxta carnem ortus est, declaret non fortuito facta, sed admirabili Dei providentia, qui tot modis procuravit salutem humani generis, non simpliciter dicit Deus, sed is qui rebus omnibus praeest, omnia suo divino consilio dispensans moderansque, cui dicit deberi laudem in omne aevum, ob insignem erga nos charitatem, cui maledicebant Judaei, dum Filium unicum blasphemiis impeterent."—Note *in loc.*, in his *Opp.* vi. (Lugd. Bat. 1705), col. 611.

So Westcott and Hort in their note on this passage in vol. ii. of their Greek Testament, remarking on the punctuation which places a colon after σάρκα as "an expression of the interpretation which implies that special force was intended to be thrown on ἐπὶ πάντων by the interposition of ὢν,"observe:—" This emphatic sense of ἐπὶ πάντων (cf. i. 16; ii. 9 f.; iii. 29 f.; x. 12; xi. 32, 36) is fully justified if St. Paul's purpose is to suggest that the tragic apostasy of the Jews (vv. 2, 3) is itself part of the dispensations of " Him who is God over all," over Jew and Gentile alike, over past present and future alike; so that the ascription of blessing to Him is a homage to His Divine purpose and power of bringing good out of evil in the course of the ages (xi. 13-16; 25-36)."—Dr. Hort remarks that " this punctuation alone seems adequate to account for the whole of the language employed, more especially when it is considered in relation to the context."

that prominence; and the position of εὐλογητός after it is required by the very same law of the Greek language which governs all the examples that have been alleged against the doxological construction of the passage. This thought of God as the Ruler over All re-appears in the doxology at the end of the eleventh chapter (xi. 36), where the Apostle concludes his grand Theodicy: "For from Him, and through Him, and to Him, are ALL THINGS : to Him is the glory for ever! Amen." Compare also Eph. i. 11, cited by Mr. Beet: "foreordained according to the purpose of him who worketh ALL THINGS after the counsel of his will;" and so in another doxology (1 Tim. i. 17) suggested by the mention of Christ, the ascription is τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων, "to the King OF THE AGES." *

I prefer, on the whole, to take πάντων as neuter; but much might be said in favor of the view of Fritzsche, whose note on this passage is especially valuable. He, with many other scholars, regards it as masculine: "*Qui omnibus praeest hominibus* (i. e. qui et Judaeis et gentilibus consulit Deus, der ueber allen Menschen waltende Gott) *sit celebratus perpetuo, amen.*" (C. F. A. Fritzsche, *Pauli ad Rom. Epist.*, tom. ii. [1839], p. 272.) He refers for the πάντων to Rom. x. 12; xi. 32; iii. 29.

We may note here, that while the Apostle says ὧν οἱ πατέρες, he does not say ὧν, but ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός. He could not forget the thought, which pervades the Epistle, that the Messiah was for *all* men alike. Nor does he forget that while by natural descent, κατὰ σάρκα, Christ was "from the Jews," he was κατὰ πνεῦμα, and in all that constituted him the Messiah, "from GOD," who "anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power," who "made him both Lord and Christ," who marked him out as his "Son" by raising him from the dead (Acts xiii. 33; Rom. i. 4) and setting him at his right hand in the heavenly places, and giving him to be the head over all things to the Church (Eph. i. 20-22), that Church in which there is no distinction of "Greek and Jew," "but Christ is all, and in all."

That such words as εὐλογητός, εὐλογημένος, μακάριος, and ἐπικατάρατος should usually stand first in the sentence in expressions of benediction, macarism, and malediction, is natural in Greek for the

---

* This seems to me the true rendering, rather than "to the King *eternal*," though eternity is implied. Comp. Rev. xv. 3 Westc. and Hort; Sir. xxxvi. 22 (al. xxxiii. 19); Tob. xiii. 6, 10; Ps. cxliv. (cxlv.) 13; Clem. Rom. *Ep. ad Cor.* cc. 35, 3; 55, 6; 61, 2; Const. Apost. vii. 34; Lit. S. Jac. c. 13. So Exod. xv. 18, κύριος βασιλεύων τῶν αἰώνων, as cited by Philo, *De Plant. Noë*, c. 12 *bis* (*Opp.* i. 336, 337 ed. Mang.), *De Mundo* c. 7 (*Opp.* ii. 608), and read in many cursive MSS.; Joseph. *Ant.* i. 18, § 6, δέσποτα παντὸς αἰῶνος. *Contra*, Test. xii Patr., *Ruben*, c. 6.

same reason that it is natural in English to give the first place to such words as "blessed," "happy," "cursed." It makes no difference, as a study of the examples will show, whether the expression be *optative*, as is usually the case with εὐλογημένος, with the ellipsis of εἴη or ἔστω, or *declarative*, as in the case of μακάριος, and usually, I believe, of εὐλογητός, ἔστι being understood.* The ellipsis of the substantive verb gives rapidity and force to the expression, indicating a certain glow of feeling. But in Greek as in English, if the subject is more prominent in the mind of the writer, and is not overweighted with descriptive appendages, there is nothing to hinder a change of order, but the genius of the language rather requires it.

The example commonly adduced of this variation in the case of εὐλογητός is Ps. lxvii. (Heb. lxviii.) 20, *Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς εὐλογητός, εὐλογητὸς κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν*, where we find εὐλογητός in both positions. This peculiarity is the result of a misconstruction and perhaps also of a false reading (Meyer) of the Hebrew. The example shows that the position of εὐλογητός after the subject violates no law of the Greek language; but on account of the repetition of εὐλογητός I do not urge it as a parallel to Rom. ix. 5. (See above, p. 32 f.). On the other hand, the passage cited by Grimm (see above, p. 34) from the apocryphal Psalms of Solomon, viii. 41, 42, written probably about 48 B. C., seems to me quite to the purpose :

> αἰνετὸς κύριος ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν αὐτοῦ ἐν στόματι ὁσίων,
> καὶ σὺ εὐλογημένος, Ἰσραήλ, ὑπὸ κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. †

Here, in the first line, αἰνετός precedes, because the predicate is emphatic; but in the second, the subject σύ precedes, because it is meant to receive the emphasis. I perceive no antithesis or studied chiasmus here. The sentence is no more a "double" or "compound" one than Gen. xiv. 19, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33; Ps. lxxi.

---

*I believe that εὐλογητός in doxologies is distinguished from εὐλογημένος as *laudandus* is from *laudatus;* and that the doxology in Rom. ix. 5 is therefore strictly a declarative, not an optative one. The most literal and exact rendering into Latin would be something like this: "Ille qui est super omnia Deus laudandus (est) in aeternum!" Where the verb is expressed with εὐλογητός (as very often in the formula εὐλογητὸς εἶ) it is always, I believe, in the indicative. Here I must express my surprise that Canon Farrar (*The Expositor*, vol. ix. p. 402 ; vol. x. p. 238) should deny that Rom. i. 25 and 2 Cor. xi. 31 are "doxologies." What is a doxology but a pious ascription of glory or praise? If ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν, Rom. i. 25. is "not a doxology at all" on account of the ἔστιν, then Matt. vi. 13 (text rec.) and 1 Pet. iv. 11 are, for the same reason, not doxologies.

†See O. F. Fritzsche, *Libri apoc. V. T. Gr.* (1871), p. 579, or Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum* (1869), p. 14.

(lxxii.) 18, 19 ; Tob. xi. 13, and 16 (Sin.) ; Judith xiii. 18 ; Orat. Azar. 2 ; and I see no reason why the fact that the clauses are connected by καί should affect the position of εὐλογητός here more than in those passages—no reason why it should affect it at all.

Another example in which the subject precedes ἐπικατάρατος and εὐλογημένος in an optative or possibly a predictive sentence is Gen. xxvii. 29, ὁ καταρώμενός σε ἐπικατάρατος, ὁ δὲ εὐλογῶν σε εὐλογημένος. Here the Greek follows the order of the Hebrew, and the reason for the unusual position in both I suppose to be the fact that the contrast between ὁ καταρώμενος and ὁ εὐλογῶν naturally brought the subjects into the foreground. It is true that in Rom. ix. 5, as I understand the passage (though others take a different view), there is no antithesis, as there is here ; but the example shows that when for any reason the writer wishes to make the subject prominent, there is no law of the Greek language which imprisons such a predicate as εὐλογημένος at the beginning of the sentence.

Another example, in a declarative sentence, but not the less pertinent on that account (the verb not being expressed), is Gen. xxvi. 29, according to what I believe to be the true reading, καὶ νῦν σὺ εὐλογητὸς ὑπὸ κυρίου, where the σύ being emphatic, as is shown by the corresponding order in Hebrew, stands before εὐλογητός. Contrast Gen. iii. 14 ; iv. 11 ; Josh. ix. 29 (al. 23). This reading is supported by all the uncial MSS. that contain the passage, viz., I. Cod. Cotton. (cent. v.), III. Alex. (v.), X. Coislin. (vii.), and Bodl. (viii. or ix.) ed. Tisch. *Mon. Sacr. Ined.* vol. ii. (1857), p. 234, with at least 25 cursives, and the Aldine edition, also by all the ancient versions except the Ethiopic, and the Latin, which translates freely, against the καὶ νῦν εὐλογημένος σύ of the Roman edition, which has very little authority here.

Still another case where in a declarative sentence the usual order of subject and predicate is reversed, both in the Greek and the Hebrew, is 1 Kings ii. 45 (al. 46), καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμὼν εὐλογημένος, the ellipsis being probably ἔσται. Here I suppose the reason for the exceptional order to be the contrast between Solomon and Shimei (ver. 44).

It is a curious fact that μακαριστός, a word perfectly analogous to εὐλογητός, and which would naturally stand first in the predicate, happens to follow the subject in the only instances of its use in the Septuagint which come into comparison here, viz.: Prov. xiv. 21; xvi. 20; xxix. 18. The reason seems to be the same as in the case we have just considered; there is a contrast of subjects. For the same reason ἐπικατάρατος follows the subject in Wisd. xiv. 8 (comp. ver. 7).

These examples go to confirm Winer's statement in respect to contrasted subjects.   And I must here remark, in respect to certain passages which have been alleged in opposition (see above, p. 36), that I can perceive no contrast of subjects in Gen. xiv. 19, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33; and still less in Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 53, where the doxology appears to have no relation to what precedes, but to be rather the formal doxology, appended by the compiler, which concludes the Third Book of the Psalms (comp. Ps. xl. (xli.) 14).

It may be said that none of the examples we have been considering is *precisely* similar to Rom. ix. 5.   But they all illustrate the fact that there is nothing to hinder a Greek writer from changing the ordinary position of εὐλογητός and kindred words when from any cause the subject is naturally more prominent in his mind.   They show that the *principle* of the rule which governs the position may authorize or require a deviation from the common order.   I must further agree with Meyer and Ellicott on Eph. i. 3, and Fritzsche on Rom. ix. 5, in regarding as not altogether irrelevant such passages as Ps. cxii. (cxiii.) 2, εἴη τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου εὐλογημένον, where, though εἴη precedes, as a copula it can have no emphasis, and the position of εὐλογημένον is determined by the fact that the subject rather than the predicate here naturally presents itself first to the mind.   The difference between such a sentence and εὐλογημένον τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου is like that in English between " May the name of the Lord be blessed" and " Blessed be the name of the Lord."   It is evident, I think, that in the latter sentence the predicate is made more prominent, and in the former the subject; but if a person does not *feel* this, it cannot be proved.   Other examples of this kind are Ruth ii. 19; 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chron. ix. 8; Job i. 21; Dan. ii. 20; Lit. S. Jac. c. 19; Lit. S. Marci, c. 20, a. (Hammond, pp. 52, 192.)   In Ps. cxii. (cxiii.) 2 and Job i. 21 the prominence given to the subject is suggested by what precedes.

I will give one example of the fallacy of merely empirical rules respecting the position of words.   Looking at Young's *Analytical Concordance,* there are, if I have counted right, 138 instances in which, in sentences like "Blessed be God," "Blessed are the meek," the word "blessed" precedes the subject in the common English Bible. There is no exception to this usage in the Old Testament or the New. "Here," exclaims the empiric, "is a law of the language.   To say 'God be blessed' is not English."   But if we look into the Apocrypha, we find that our translators *have* said it, namely in Tobit xi. 17, and so it stands also in the Genevan version, though the Greek reads εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός.   Why the translators changed the

order must be a matter of conjecture ; perhaps it was to make a contrast with the last clause of the sentence.

There is a homely but important maxim which has been forgotten in many discussions of the passage before us, that "circumstances alter cases." I have carefully examined all the examples of doxology or benediction in the New Testament and the Septuagint, and in other ancient writings, as the Liturgies, in which εὐλογητός or εὐλογημένος precedes the subject; and there is not one among them which, so far as I can judge, justifies the assumption that because εὐλογητός precedes the subject there, it would probably have done so here, had it been the purpose of Paul to introduce a doxology. The cases in which a doxology begins without a previous enumeration of blessings, but in which the *thought* of the blessing prompts an exclamation of praise or thanksgiving,—"Blessed be God, who" or "for he" has done this or that,—are evidently not parallel. All the New Testament doxologies with εὐλογητός, and most of those in the Septuagint, are of this character.* In all these cases, we perceive at once that any other order would be strange. The expression of the *feeling*, which requires but one word, naturally precedes the mention of the ground of the feeling, which often requires very many. But there is a difference between εὐλογητός and εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Where it would be natural for the former to precede the subject, it might be more natural for the latter to follow. In the example adduced by Dr. Dwight in his criticism of Winer (see above, pp. 36, 37), it is evident that εὐλογητός more naturally stands first in the sentence; at the end it would be abrupt and unrhythmical. But I cannot think that a Greek scholar would find anything hard or unnatural in the sentence if it read, ὁ διατηρήσας τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον ἀμίαντον εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

To make the argument from usage a rational one, examples sufficient in number to form the basis of an induction should be produced in which in passages *like the present* εὐλογητός precedes the subject. Suppose we should read here εὐλογητὸς ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, we instantly see that the reference of εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας becomes, to say the least, ambiguous, the "for ever" grammatically connecting itself with the phrase "he who is God over all" rather than with "blessed." If to avoid this we read, εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ὁ ὢν

---

* See Luke i. 68 ; 2 Cor. i. 3 ; Eph. i. 3 ; 1 Pet. i. 3.—Gen. xiv. 20 ; xxiv. 27 ; Ex. xviii. 10 ; Ruth iv. 14 ; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 39 ; 2 Sam. xviii. 28 ; 1 Kings i. 48 ; v. 7 ; viii. 15, 56 ; 2 Chr. ii. 12 ; vi. 4 ; Ezr. vii. 27 ; Ps. xxvii. (Sept.) 6 ; xxx. 22 ; lxv. 20 ; lxxi. 18 ; cxxiii. 6 ; cxxxiv. 21 ; cxliii. 1 ; Dan. iii. 28 Theodot., 95 Sept.

ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, we have a sentence made unnaturally heavy and clumsy by the interposition of εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας before the subject, a sentence to which I believe no parallel can be produced in the whole range of extant doxologies.   Wherever εὐλογητός precedes, the subject *directly* follows.   These objections to the transposition appear to me in themselves a sufficient reason why the Apostle should have preferred the present order.   But we must also consider that any other arrangement would have failed to make prominent the particular conception of God, which the context suggests, as the Ruler over All. If, then, the blessings mentioned by the Apostle suggested to his mind the thought of God as εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, in view of that overruling providence which sees the end from the beginning, which brings good out of evil and cares for all men alike, I must agree with Winer that "the present position of the words is not only altogether suitable, but even necessary."   (*Gram.*, 7te Aufl., § 61. 3. e. p. 513; p. 551 Thayer, p. 690 Moulton.)   Olshausen, though he understands the passage as relating to Christ, well says:—"Rückert's remark, that εὐλογητός, when applied to God, must, according to the idiom of the Old and New Testament, always precede the noun, is of no weight.   Köllner rightly observes, that the position of words is altogether [everywhere] not a mechanical thing, but determined, in each particular conjuncture, by the connexion, and by the purpose of the speaker." *

7.   The argument founded on the notion that the Apostle here had in mind Ps. lxvii. (lxviii.) 20, and was thereby led to describe Christ as θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, is one which so far as I know never occurred to any commentator ancient or modern before the ingenious Dr. Lange.   It is evidently so fanciful, and has been so completely demolished by Dr. Dwight (see above, p. 33, note), that any further notice of it would be a waste of words.

8.   The argument for the reference of the ὁ ὤν, &c., to Christ, founded on supposed patristic authority, will be considered below under IV., in connection with the history of the interpretation of the passage.

II.   I HAVE thus endeavored to show that the construction of the last part of the verse as a doxology suits the context, and that the principal objections urged against it have little or no weight.

---

* Olshausen, *Bibl. Comm. on the N. T.*, vol. iv. p. 88, note, Kendrick's trans.—The remark cited from Rückert belongs to the first edition of his Commentary (1831).   In the second edition (1839) Rückert changed his view of the passage, and adopted the construction which makes the last part of the verse a doxology to God.

But the construction followed in the common version is also gram-
matically objectionable; and if we assume that the Apostle and those
whom he addressed believed Christ to be God, this construction like-
wise suits the context.

How then shall we decide the question ? If it was an ambiguous
sentence in Plato or Aristotle, our first step would be to see what light
was thrown on the probabilities of the case by *the writer's use of lan-
guage elsewhere*. Looking then at the question from this point of
view, I find three reasons for preferring the construction which refers
the last part of the verse to God.

1. The use of the word εὐλογητός, "blessed," which never occurs in
the New Testament in reference to Christ. If we refer εὐλογητός to
God, our passage accords with the doxologies Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. i.
3; xi. 31; and Eph. i. 3. In Rom. i. 25 we have εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς
αἰῶνας, as here; and 2 Cor. xi. 31, "The God and Father [*or* God,
the Father] of the Lord Jesus knows—he who is blessed for ever !—
that I lie not," strongly favors the reference of the εὐλογητός to God. *
It alone seems to me almost decisive. The word εὐλογητός is else-
where in the New Testament used in doxologies to God (Luke i. 68;
1 Pet. i. 3); and in Mark xiv. 61, ὁ εὐλογητός, "the Blessed One,"
is a special designation of the Supreme Being, in accordance with the
language of the later Jews, in whose writings God is often spoken of
as "the Holy One, blessed be He !"

I have already spoken (see above, p. 95) of the rarity of doxologies
to Christ in the writings of Paul, the only instance being 2 Tim. iv.
18, though here Fritzsche (*Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 268) and Canon Kennedy
(*Ely Lectures*, p. 87) refer the κύριος to God. Doxologies and thanks-
givings to God are on the other hand very frequent in his Epistles.
Those with εὐλογητός are given above; for those with δόξα, see Rom.
xi. 36; xvi. 27; Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 21; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17
(τιμὴ καὶ δόξα);—τιμὴ καὶ κράτος, 1 Tim. vi. 16. (Comp. δοξάζω,
Rom. xv. 6, 9.) Thanksgivings, with χάρις first, Rom. vi. 17; vii.
25 (Lachm., Tisch., Treg., WH.); 2 Cor. viii. 16; ix. 15; τῷ δὲ
θεῷ first, 1 Cor. xv. 57; 2 Cor. ii. 14; εὐχαριστῶ, Rom. i. 8; 1
Cor. i. 4; (14.) xiv. 18; Eph. i. 16; Phil. i. 3; Col. i. 3, 12; 1 Thess.
i. 2; ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 3; ii. 13; Philem. 4. Note especially the
direction, "*giving thanks always* for all things in the name of our
Lord Jesus Christ *to God*, even the Father," Eph. v. 20; comp. Col.
iii. 17, "do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, *giving thanks to God*

---

*For the way in which the Rabbinical writers are accustomed to in-
troduce doxologies into the middle of a sentence, see Schoettgen's
Horae Hebraicae on 2 Cor. xi. 31.

the Father through him." These facts appear to me to strengthen
the presumption founded on the usage of εὐλογητός, that in this pas-
sage of ambiguous construction the doxological words should be re-
ferred to God rather than to Christ.

It may be of some interest to observe that in the Epistle of Clement
of Rome to the Corinthians, probably the earliest Christian writing
that has come down to us outside of the New Testament, there are
eight doxologies to God, namely cc. 32, 38, 43, 45, 58, 61, 64, 65,
and none that clearly belong to Christ. Two are ambiguous, viz. cc.
20, 50, like Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11, which a majority of the best
commentators refer to God as the leading subject; see above, p. 46.
The clear cases of doxologies to Christ in the N. T. are Rev. i. 6; 2
Pet. iii. 18 (a book of doubtful genuineness); and Rev. v. 13, "to
Him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb;" comp. vii. 10.
But our concern is chiefly with the usage of Paul.

The argument from the exclusive use of the word εὐλογητός in ref-
erence to God has been answered by saying that εὐλογητός is also
applied to man; and Deut. vii. 14; Ruth ii. 20; and 1 Sam. xv. 13
are cited as examples of this by Dr. Gifford. But he overlooks the
fact that εὐλογητός is there used in a totally different sense, viz.
"favored" or "blessed" by God. To speak of a person as "bles-
sed" by God, or to pray that he may be so, and to address a doxology
to him, are very different things.

Note further that εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ps. cxvii.
(cxviii.) 26, applied to Christ in Matt. xxi. 9 and the parallel pas-
sages, is not a doxology; comp. Mark xi. 10; Luke i. 28, 42.

On the distinction between εὐλογητός and εὐλογημένος see Note B,
at the end of this article.

2.   The most striking parallel to ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων in the writings of
Paul is in Eph. iv. 5, 9, where Christians are said to have "one
Lord, one faith, one baptism, one *God* and Father of all, *who is over
all* (ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων), and through all, and in all." Here it is used of
the one *God*, expressly distinguished from Christ.

3.   The Apostle's use of the word θεός, "God," throughout his
Epistles. This word occurs in the Pauline Epistles, not including
that to the Hebrews, more than 500 times; and there is not a single
clear instance in which it is applied to Christ. Alford, and many
other Trinitarian commentators of the highest character, find no
instance except the present. Now, in a case of ambiguous construc-
tion, ought not this *uniform* usage of the Apostle in respect to one of
the most common words to have great weight? To me it is abso-
lutely decisive.

It may be said, however, that Paul has nowhere declared that Christ is *not* God; and that even if he has not happened to give him this title in any other passage he must have believed him to be God, and therefore might have so designated him if occasion required.

As to the statement that Paul has nowhere expressly affirmed that Christ was *not* God, it does not appear that, supposing him to have believed this, he ever had occasion to say it. It is certainly a remarkable fact that, whatever may have been the teaching of Paul concerning the nature of Christ and the mode of his union with God, it appears, so far as we can judge from his writings, to have raised no question as to whether he was or was not God; jealous as the Jews were of the Divine unity, and disposed as the Gentiles were to recognize many Gods beside the Supreme.

It is important to observe, in general, that in respect to the application to Christ of the *name* "God," there is a very wide difference between the usage not only of Paul, but of all the New Testament writers, and that which we find in Christian writers of the second and later centuries. There is no clear instance, in which any New Testament *writer*, speaking in his own person, has called Christ God. In John i. 18 the text is doubtful; and in 1 John v. 20 the οὗτος more naturally refers to the leading subject in what precedes, namely, τὸν ἀληθινόν, and is so understood by the best grammarians, as Winer and Buttmann, and by many eminent Trinitarian commentators (see above, p. 19). In John i. 1 θεός is the predicate not of the historical Christ, but of the antemundane Logos. The passages which have been alleged from the writings of Paul will be noticed presently.*

But it may be said that even if there is no other passage in which Paul has called Christ God, there are many in which the works and the attributes of God are ascribed to him, and in which he is recognized as the object of divine worship; so that we ought to find no difficulty in supposing that he is here declared to be "God blessed for ever." It may be said in reply, that the passages referred to do not authorize the inference which has been drawn from them; and that if they are regarded as doing so, the unity of God would seem to be infringed. A discussion of this subject would lead us out of the field of exegesis into the tangled thicket of dogmatic theology; we should

---

* On John xx. 28 and Heb. i. 8, 9, which do not belong to the category we are now considering, I simply refer, for the sake of brevity, to Norton's *Statement of Reasons*, &c., new edition (1856), p. 300 ff., and the note of E. A., or to the note of Lücke on the former passage, and of Prof. Stuart on the latter.

have to consider the questions of consubstantiality, eternal generation, the hypostatic union, and the *kenosis*. Such a discussion would here be out of place. But it is certainly proper to look at the passages where Paul has used the clearest and strongest language concerning the dignity of Christ and his relation to the Father, and ask ourselves whether they allow us to regard it as probable that he has here spoken of him as " God over all, blessed for ever," or even as " over all, God blessed for ever."

In the Epistles which purport to be written by Paul there is only one passage besides the present in which any considerable number of respectable scholars now suppose that he has actually called Christ *God*, namely, Titus ii. 13. Here the new Revised Version, in the text, makes him speak of " our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." But the uncertainty of this translation is indicated by the marginal rendering, " the great God and our Saviour"; and in a former paper I have stated my reasons for believing the latter construction the true one. (See above, p. 3 ff.) This latter construction was preferred by a large majority of the American Company of Revisers, and it has the support of many other eminent Trinitarian scholars. Surely so doubtful a passage cannot serve to render it probable that Christ is called " God blessed for ever " in Rom. ix. 5.

Acts xx. 28 has also been cited, where, according to the *textus receptus*, Paul, in his address to the Ephesian elders, is represented as speaking of " the Church of God, which he purchased with his own blood." This reading is adopted by the English Revisers, in their text, and also by Scrivener, Alford, and Westcott and Hort; but its doubtfulness is indicated by the marginal note against the word " God," in which the Revisers say, " Many ancient authorities read *the Lord*." Here again the marginal reading is preferred by the American Revisers, as also by Lachmann, Tregelles, Green, Davidson and Tischendorf. I have given my reasons for believing this the true reading in an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1876, pp. 313–352. And although Westcott and Hort adopt the reading *God*, Dr. Hort well remarks that " the supposition that by the precise designation τοῦ θεοῦ, standing alone as it does here, with the article and without any adjunct, St. Paul (or St. Luke) meant Christ, is unsupported by any analogies of language." Calling attention to the fact that the true text has the remarkable form διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου, he would understand the passage, " on the supposition that the text is incorrupt," as speaking of the Church of God which he purchased " 'through the blood that was His own,' *i. e.* as being his Son's." " This conception," he remarks, " of the death of Christ as a price

paid by the Father is in strict accordance with St. Paul's own language elsewhere (Rom. v. 8; viii. 32). It finds repeated expression in the Apostolic Constitutions in language evidently founded on this passage (ii. 57. 13; 61. 4; vii. 26. 1; viii. [11. 2.] 12. 18; 41. 4)." On the supposition that θεοῦ is the true reading, the passage has been understood in a similar manner not merely by Socinian interpreters, as Wolzogen and Enjedinus, but by Erasmus (in his *Paraphrase*), Pellican,* Limborch (though he prefers the reading κυρίου), Milton (*De Doctrina Christiana*, Pars I. c. v. p. 86, or Eng. trans. p. 148 f.), Lenfant and Beausobre as an alternative interpretation (*Le Nouveau Test.*, note *in loc.*), Doederlein (*Inst. Theol. Christ.* ed. 6ta, 1797, § 105, Obs. 4, p. 387), Van der Palm (note in his Dutch translation), Granville Penn (*The Book of the New Covenant*, London, 1836, and *Annotations*, 1837, p. 315), and Mr. Darby (*Trans. of the N. T.*, 2d ed. [1872]). Dr. Hort however is disposed to conjecture that ΥΙΟΥ dropped out after ΤΟΥΥΔΙΟΥ "at some very early transcription, affecting all existing documents." Granville Penn had before made the same suggestion. It is obvious that no argument in support of any particular construction of Rom. ix. 5 can be prudently drawn from such a passage as this.

A few other passages in which some scholars still suppose that the name *God* is given to Christ by Paul have been examined in the paper on Titus ii. 13; see above, notes to pp. 3, 10, also p. 44.

Let us now look at the passages in which Paul has used the most exalted language respecting the person and dignity of Christ, and ask ourselves how far they afford a presumption that he might here describe him as "God blessed for ever."

The passage in this Epistle most similar to the present is ch. i. ver. 3, 4, where Christ is said to be "born of the seed of David as to the flesh," but "declared to be the Son of God with power as to the spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead," or more exactly, "by the resurrection of the dead." Here the antithesis to κατὰ σάρκα is supplied. It is not, however, κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, or κατὰ τὴν θείαν φύσιν, but κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, "as to his holy spirit,"—his higher spiritual nature, distinguished especially by the characteristic of *holiness*. There are many nice and difficult questions connected with this passage, which need not be here discussed; I will only say that I see no ground for finding in it a presumption that the Apostle would desig-

---

* "Erga congregationem dei quae vobis oscitanter curanda non est, ut quam deus adeò charam habuit, ut unigeniti sui sanguine eam paraverit." *Comm.* in loc., Tiguri, 1537, fol.

nate Christ as "God blessed for ever."   Some, however, suppose that
the title "Son of God" is essentially equivalent to θεός, and that the
resurrection of Christ as an act of his own divine power is adduced
here as a proof of his deity.   I do not find the first supposition sup-
ported by the use of the term in the Old Testament or in the New
(see John x. 36), and as to the second, it may be enough to say that
it contradicts the uniform representation of the Apostle Paul on the
subject, who everywhere refers his resurrection to the power of "God,
the Father"; see Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 19, 20; Rom. iv. 24; vi. 4; viii.
11; x. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 14; xv. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 14; xiii. 4; 1 Thes. i. 10;
Acts xiii. 30–37; xvii. 31.

Another striking passage is Phil. ii. 6–11, where the Apostle says
that Christ, "existing in the form of God, counted not the being on
an equality with God* a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself,
taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men."
Without entering into any detailed discussion of this passage, it may
be enough to remark that being in the form of God, as Paul uses the
expression here, is a very different thing from being God; that the
μορφή cannot denote the nature or essence of Christ, because it is
something of which he is represented as emptying or divesting him-
self.   The same is true of the τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, "the being on an
equality with God," or "like God," which is spoken of as something
which he was not eager to *seize*, according to one way of under-
standing ἁρπαγμόν, or not eager to *retain*, according to another inter-
pretation.†   The Apostle goes on to say that on account of this
self-abnegation and his obedience even unto death "GOD *highly
exalted* him and *gave* him the name which is above every name; that
in the name of Jesus every knee should bow . . .   and that every
tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God,
the Father."   I cannot think that this passage, distinguishing Christ
as it does so clearly from God, and representing his present exaltation
as a reward bestowed upon him by God, renders it at all likely that
Paul would call him "God blessed for ever."

We find a still more remarkable passage in the Epistle to the Col-
ossians, i. 15–20, where it is affirmed concerning the Son that "he

* Or, as the Rev. Dr. B. H. Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek in
the University of Cambridge, translates it, "the being like God"; com-
pare Whitby's note on the use of ἴσα.   See Kennedy's *Occasional Ser-
mons preached before the University of Cambridge*, London, 1877, p.
62, or *Ely Lectures* (1882), p. 17 f.

† See Grimm's *Lexicon Novi Testamenti*, ed. 2da (1879), s. v. μορφή,
for one view; for another, Weiss's *Biblische Theol. des N. T.*, § 103 c,
p. 432 ff., 3te Aufl. (1880).

is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in
him were all things created, things visible and invisible, whether
thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been
created through him and unto him; and he is before all things, and
in him all things consist [*or* hold together].   And he is the head of
the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the
dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence [more liter-
ally, "*become* first"].   For it was the good pleasure [of the Father]
that in him should all the fulness dwell; and through him to reconcile
all things unto himself."   In this passage, and in Col. ii. 9, 10,
where the Apostle says of Christ "in him dwelleth all the fulness of
the Godhead bodily, and in him are ye made full, who is the head of
all principality and power," we find, I believe, the strongest language
which Paul has anywhere used concerning Christ's position in the
universe, and his relation to the Church.   I waive all question of the
genuineness of the Epistle.   Does then the language here used
render it probable that Paul would, on occasion, designate Christ as
"over all, God blessed for ever"?

Here certainly, if anywhere, we might expect that he would call
him God; but he has not only not done so, but has carefully distin-
guished him from the being for whom he seems to reserve that name.
He does not call him God, but "the *image* of the invisible God,"
(comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4, and 1 Cor. xi. 7).   His agency in the work of
creation is also restricted and made secondary by the use of the
prepositions ἐν and διά, clearly indicating that the conception in the
mind of the Apostle is the same which appears in the Epistle to the
Hebrews, i. 3 ; that he is not the primary source of the power exerted
in creation, but the being "*through* whom GOD *made* the worlds,"
δι' οὗ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας; comp. also 1 Cor. viii. 6, Eph. iii. 9
(though here διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is not genuine), and the well-known
language of Philo concerning the Logos.*   Neither Paul nor any

---

* Philo calls the Logos the "Son of God," "the eldest son," "the
first-begotten," and his representation of his agency in creation is very
similar to that which Paul here attributes to "the Son of God's love"
(ver. 13).   He describes the Logos as "the *image* of God, *through* whom
the whole world was framed," εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κ. τ. λ. (*De Monarch.*
ii. 5, Opp. ii. 225 ed. Mangey); "the instrument, through which [*or*
whom] the world was built," ὄργανον δι' οὗ κ. τ. λ. (*De Cherub.* c. 35,
Opp. i. 162, where note Philo's distinction between τὸ ὑφ'οὗ, τὸ ἐξ οὗ, τὸ
δι' οὗ, and τὸ δι' ὅ); "the shadow of God, using whom as an instrument
he made the world" (*Legg. Alleg.* iii. 31, Opp. i. 106).   In two or three
places he exceptionally applies the term θεός to the Logos, professedly
using it in a lower sense (ἐν καταχρήσει), and making a distinction be-
tween θεός, without the article, "*a* divine being," and ὁ θεός, "*the*

other New Testament writer uses the preposition ὑπό, "by," in speaking of the agency of the Son or Logos in creation.   The designation "firstborn of all creation" seems also a very strange one to be applied to Christ conceived of as God.   Some of the most orthodox Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, as Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Augustine, were so perplexed by it that they understood the Apostle to be speaking here of the new, spiritual creation;* and the passage has been explained as relating to this by some eminent modern interpreters, as Grotius, Wetstein, Ernesti, Noesselt, Heinrichs, Schleiermacher, Baumgarten–Crusius, Norton, though, I believe, erroneously.   But I shall not discuss here the meaning of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.   I would only call attention to the way in which the Apostle speaks of the *good pleasure* of God, the Father, as the *source* of Christ's fulness of gifts and powers.   " For it was the good pleasure [of God] that in him should all the fulness dwell" (ver. 19). †   This declaration explains also Col. ii. 9 ; compare Eph. iii. 19; iv. 13; John i. 16.   See also John xiv. 10; iii. 34(?).

It thus appears, I think, first, that there is no satisfactory evidence that Paul has elsewhere called Christ *God ;* and secondly, that in the passages in which he speaks of his dignity and power in the most exalted language, he not only seems studiously to avoid giving him this appellation, but represents him as *deriving* his dignity and power from the being to whom, in distinction from Christ, he everywhere gives that name,—the "one God, the Father."

Divine Being." (See *De Somn.* i. 38, Opp. i. 655, and comp. *Legg. Alleg.* iii. 73, Opp. i. 128, l. 43.) In a fragment preserved by Eusebius (*Praep. Evang.* vii. 13, or Philonis *Opp.* ii. 625) he names the Logos ὁ δεύτερος θεός, " the second [*or* inferior] God," distinguished from " the Most High and Father of the universe," " the God who is before [*or* above, πρό] the Logos." So he applies the term to Moses (comp. Exod. vii. 1,) and says that it may be used of one who " procures good (τὸ ἀγαθὸν) for others," and is " wise." *De Mut. Nom.* c. 22, Opp. i. 597, 598; see also *De Mos.* i. 28, Opp. ii. 106 [misprinted 108], where Moses is called ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους θεὸς καὶ βασιλεύς; *Quod det. pot. insid.* c. 44, Opp. i. 222; *De Migr. Abr.* c. 15, Opp. i. 449; *Legg. Alleg.* i. 13, Opp. i. 151; *Quod omn. prob. liber*, c. 7, Opp. ii. 452; *De Decem. Orac.* c. 23, Opp. ii. 201. But though he speaks of the Logos in language as exalted as Paul uses concerning the Son, he would never have dreamed of calling him ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλόγητος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

*See Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon,* p. 214 ff.

†ὁ θεός (or ὁ πατήρ) must be supplied as the subject of εὐδόκησεν; comp. ver. 20, and Lightfoot's note. So Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Eadie, and the great majority of expositors.

We have considered the strongest passages which have been adduced
to justify the supposition that Paul *might* apply this title to Christ.
I have already intimated that they do not seem to me to authorize
this supposition.   But admitting, for the sake of argument, that we
must infer from these and other passages that he really held the doc-
trine of the consubstantiality and co-eternity of the Son with the
Father, and that on this account he would have been *justified* in call-
ing him God, this does not remove the great improbability that he
has so designated him, incidentally, in Rom. ix. 5, in opposition to
a usage of the term which pervades all his writings.   The question
still forces itself upon us, What was the ground of this usage ?   *Why*
has he elsewhere avoided giving him this title?   In answering this
question here, wishing to avoid as far as possible all dogmatic
discussion, and to confine myself to exegetical considerations,
I shall not transgress the limits of recognized orthodoxy.   The
doctrine of the *subordination* of the Son to the Father, in his
divine as well as his human nature, has been held by a very large
number, and if I mistake not, by a majority, of professed believers
in the deity of Christ.   The fourth and last Division or " Section "
of Bishop Bull's famous *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae* is entitled *De Subor-
dinatione Filii ad Patrem, ut ad sui originem ac principium.*   He main-
tains and proves that the Fathers who lived before and many, at least,
of those who lived after the Council of Nice unequivocally acknowl-
edged this subordination (though the post-Nicene writers were more
guarded in their language), and that on this account, while calling
the Son θεός, and θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ, as begotten from the substance of the
Father, they were accustomed to reserve such titles as ὁ θεός used
absolutely, εἷς θεός, and ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων or ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός for the Father
alone.   The Father alone was "uncaused," "unoriginated," "the
fountain of deity " to the Son and Spirit. *   Now the word θεός
was often used by the Fathers of the second and later centuries not
as a proper, but as a common name ; angels, and even Christians,
especially in their beatified state, might be and were called θεοί.   It
had also a metaphorical and rhetorical use, quite foreign from the
style of the New Testament. †   All this made it easy and natural,

---

* " The ancient doctors of the church," as Bishop Pearson remarks,
" have not stuck to call the Father ' the origin, the cause, the author, the
root, the fountain, and the head of the Son,' or the whole Divinity."
Exposition of the Creed, Chap. I. p. 38, Nichols's ed.

†For proof and illustration of what has been stated, see Norton's *Gen-
uineness of the Gospels*, 2d ed., vol. iii. Addit. Note D, " On the Use of
the Words θεός and *deus*"; *Statement of Reasons*, 12th ed., pp. 113, 114
note, 120 note, 300 f., 314, 319 f., 365 note, 468; Sandius, *Interpretationes*

especially for the Fathers who were converts from heathenism, to apply the title in a relative, not absolute, sense to the Son, notwithstanding the pre-eminence which they ascribed to the Father. We find traces of this loose use of the name in Philo, as I have observed (see p. 118, note).   But there is no trace of such a use in the writings of Paul.—The points, then, which I would make are these: that even granting that he believed in the deity of the Son as set forth in the Nicene Creed, he yet held the doctrine of the *subordination* of the Son so strongly in connection with it, that we cannot wonder if *on this account* he reserved the title θεός exclusively for the Father ; and that the way in which he has expressed this subordination, and the way in which he has used this title, render it incredible that he should in this single instance (Rom. ix. 5) have suddenly transferred it to Christ, with the addition of another designation, "blessed for ever," elsewhere used by him of the Father alone.

I do not see how any one can read the Epistles of Paul without perceiving that, in speaking of the objects of Christian faith, he constantly uses θεός as a *proper name*, as the designation of the Father in distinction from Christ.   See, for example, Rom. i. 1–3, "the gospel of *God*, which he had before promised . . . concerning his Son"; ver. 7, "*God* our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ"; ver. 8, "I thank my *God*, through Jesus Christ"; ver. 9, "*God* is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit in the gospel of his Son"; and so all through the Epistle;—2 Cor. v. 18, 19, "All things are of *God*, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that *God* was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses"; Eph. v. 20, "giving thanks always for all things, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to *God*, even the Father;" though among the heathen there are gods many, and lords many (1 Cor. viii. 6) "to us there is *one God*, the Father, from whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him"; Eph. iv. 5, 6, There is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, *one God* and Father of all, *who is over all*, and through all, and in you all"; 1 Tim. ii. 5, "There is *one God*, one mediator also between God and men, [himself] a man, Christ Jesus"; v. 21, "I charge thee before *God*, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels"; Tit.

Paradoxæ (1669), p. 227 ff.; Whiston's *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, vol. iv. p. 100 ff.; Le Clerc (Clericus), *Ars Critica*, Pars II. Sect. I. c. III., vol. i. p. 145 ff., 6th ed., 1778; *Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria*, by *John* [Kaye], *Bp. of Lincoln*, 1835, p. 253.

iii. 4–6, "*God* our Saviour" poured out upon us the Holy Spirit "*through* Jesus Christ our Saviour." Observe how strongly the subordination of the Son is expressed in passages where his dignity and lordship are described in the loftiest strain: Eph. i. 16–23, " —in my prayers, that the *God of our Lord Jesus Christ*, the Father of glory, may give unto you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; . . . that ye may know what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ when *he raised him from the dead*, and *made him to sit at his right hand* in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and *he put all things in subjection under his feet*, and *gave* him to be head over all things to the Church"; 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23, "all things are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is *God's*"; xi. 3, "the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is *God;*" xv. 24, "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to *God*, even the Father; ver. 27, 28, "But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that He is excepted who did subject all things unto him. And when all things have been subjected unto him, THEN shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that *God* may be all in all."

Can we believe that he who has throughout his writings placed Christ in such a relation of *subordination* to the Father, and has habitually used the name GOD as the peculiar designation of the Father in distinction from Christ, who also calls the Father the one God, the only wise God (Rom. xvi. 27), the only God (1 Tim. i. 17), and the God of Christ, has here, in opposition to the usage elsewhere uniform of a word occurring 500 times, suddenly designated *Christ* as "over all, God blessed for ever"? At least, should not the great improbability of this turn the scale, in a passage of doubtful construction?

4. There is another consideration which seems to me to render it very improbable that Paul has here deviated from his habitual restriction of the name *God* to "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." If he has spoken of Christ in this passage as "God blessed for ever" he has done it *obiter*, as if those whom he addressed were familiar with such a conception and designation of him. But can this have been the case with the Roman church at so early a stage in the development of Christian doctrine?

It is the view of many Trinitarians that the doctrine that Christ is
God was not *explicitly* taught in the early preaching of the Apostles.
We find no trace of such teaching in the discourses of Peter or of
Stephen in the book of Acts, and none in those of the Apostle Paul
(the passage Acts xx. 28 has already been examined), as we find none
in the Synoptic Gospels, which represent the instruction concerning
Christ given by the Apostles and their companions to their converts.*
Nor does it appear in the so-called Apostles' Creed.   When we con-
sider further the fact already mentioned above (see p. 114) that Christ
is nowhere called God in any unambiguous passage by any *writer* of
the New Testament,† and that it is nowhere recorded that he ever
claimed this title, we cannot reasonably regard this abstinence from
the use of the term as accidental.   In reference to the early apostolic
preaching in particular, many of the Christian Fathers, and later
Trinitarian writers, have recognized a prudent reserve in the com-
munication of a doctrine concerning Christ and the application of a
title to him which would at once have provoked vehement opposition

---

* " There is nothing in St. Peter's Sermon upon the day of Pentecost,
which would not, in all probability, have been acknowledged by every
Ebionite Christian down to the time when they finally disappear from
history.   Yet upon such a statement of doctrine, miserably insufficient
as all orthodox churches would now call it, three thousand Jews and
proselytes were, without delay, admitted to the Sacrament of Baptism."
. . . " We must carefully bear in mind what was St. Peter's object.
It was to convince the Jews that Jesus Christ was the great appointed
Teacher whom God had sent—the true spiritual Prince whom they
were to obey.   The Apostle felt that if they acknowledged these great
truths, everything else would follow in due time."   T. W. Mossman,
B. A., Rector of Torrington, *A History of the Cath. Church of Jesus
Christ*, etc., Lond. 1873, pp. 192, 190.   Gess naïvely asks, " Wie dürfte
man von dem galiläischen Fischer, welcher der Wortführer der junger
Gemeinde war, eine befriedigende Dogmatik erwarten ? "   *Christi Per-
son und Werk*, II. i. 13.   See also Dr. John Pye Smith's *Scripture Tes-
timony to the Messiah*, Book III. Cap. V. (Vol. II. p. 151, ff., 5th ed.)

† I speak of the historical Christ, which is the subject in Rom. ix. 5.
The unique Prologue of John's Gospel, in which the *Logos* or Word is
once called $\theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ (i. 1, comp. ver. 18 in the text of Tregelles and West-
cott and Hort), cannot reasonably be regarded as parallel to the present
passage.   This is candidly admitted by Schultz, who has most elabor-
ately defended the construction which refers the last part of Rom.
ix. 5 to Christ.   He says: " Nach unseren Prämissen versteht sich von
selbst, dass wir nicht etwa daraus, dass der $\lambda\delta\gamma o\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ genannt wird,
Beweise ziehen wollen für die Zulässigkeit des Namens $\theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ für den
verklärten Jesus." (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.*, 1868, xiii. 491.)
I of course do not enter here into the difficult questions as to what was
precisely John's conception of the Logos, and in what sense he says
" the Word became flesh," language which no one understands literally.
We must consider also the late date of the Gospel of John as compared
with the Epistle to the Romans.

on the part of the unbelieving Jews, which would have been particu-
larly liable to be misunderstood by the Gentiles, and must have
required much careful explanation to reconcile it with the unity of
God and the humanity of Christ.*   We nowhere find either in the
Acts or the Epistles any trace of the controversy and questionings
which the direct announcement of such a doctrine must have excited.
The one aim of the early apostolic preaching was to convince first the
Jews, and then the Gentiles, that Jesus, whose life and teaching were
so wonderful, whom God had raised from the dead, was the Messiah,
exalted by God to be a Prince and a Saviour.   To acknowledge Jesus
as the Christ, or Jesus as Lord, which is essentially the same thing,
was the one fundamental article of the Christian faith.†   Much,
indeed, was involved in this confession; but it is now, I suppose,
fully established, and generally admitted, that the Jews in the time of
Christ had no expectation that the coming Messiah would be an
incarnation of Jehovah, and no acquaintance with the mystery of the
Trinity.‡   Such being the state of the case, it seems to me that, on

---

*For superabundant quotations from the Christian Fathers confirming
the statement made above, notwithstanding a few mistakes, see Priest-
ley's *History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ*, Book III.
Chap. IV.–VII. (Vol. III. p. 86 ff. ed. of 1786.) Or see Chrysostom's
Homilies on the Acts, *passim*.   How this doctrine would have struck a
Jew, may be seen from Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*.

†See Neander, *Hist. of the Planting and Training of the Christian
Church by the Apostles*, Book I. Chap. II.   Comp. Matt. xvi. 16; Mark
viii. 29; Luke ix. 20; John vi. 69; xx. 31; Acts ii. 36; v. 42; viii. 5; ix. 20,
22; xvii. 3; xviii. 5, 28; Rom. x. 9, *nota bene*; I Cor. xii. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 5;
I John iv. 2; v. I.

‡See the art. *Messias*, by Oehler, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie
der prot. Theol. und Kirche*, ix. 437 ff., or in the new ed. of Herzog and
Plitt, vol. ix. (1881), p. 666 ff.; Ferd. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen
palästin. Theol.* (1880), p. 146 ff., 339 ff.—Passages from the Rabbinical
writings are sometimes adduced by commentators on Rom. ix. 5 in
which the name Jehovah, or Jehovah our righteousness, is said to be
given to the Messiah.   But the irrelevance of these citations has been
repeatedly exposed; see Fritzsche, *Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 269, note; Weber, *ut
supra*, p. 342.   Weber says:—"Und wenn *Baba bathra* 75ᵇ gesagt
wird, der Messias werde nach dem Namen Jehova's יהוה צדקנו
genannt, so stehen an dieser Stelle in gleicher Beziehung die Gerechten
und Jerusalem."   Comp. Jer. xxiii. 6 with xxxiii. 16, and on this passage
see Oehler, *Theol. des A. T.*, ii. 263; Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, p.
262, note 36; Schultz, *Alttest. Theol.*, 2te Aufl. (1878), p. 740.   On Is.
ix. 6 see Schultz, p. 727; Hitzig, *Vorlesungen über bibl. Theol., u. s. w.*
(1880), p. 206 ff., and the commentators, as Gesenius, Knobel, Ewald,
Cheyne.   That the *Memra da Yeya* or "Word of Jehovah" is not identi-
fied in the Targums with the Messiah is certain; see Smith's *Dict. of the
Bible*, art. *Word*, vol. iv. p. 3557 b, Amer. ed., and Weber, *ut supra*, p.
339.   It is time that the book Zohar, which figures so conspicuously in
Schoettgen, Bertholdt, and other writers, but is now proved to be a
pseudograph of the thirteenth century, should cease to be quoted as an

the supposition that the Apostles were fully enlightened in regard to the mystery of the Trinity and the hypostatic union, the only tenable ground to be taken is, that they wisely left these doctrines to develop themselves gradually in "the Christian consciousness." As Dr. Pye Smith remarks, "The whole revelation of the Christian system was given by an advancing process. It cannot, therefore be a matter of surprise, that the doctrine concerning the person of the Messiah was developed gradually, and that its clearest manifestation is to be found in the latest written books of the New Testament." (*Ut supra*, p. 155.) Canon Westcott observes, "The study of the Synoptists, of the Apocalypse and of the Gospel of St. John in succession enables us to see under what human conditions the full majesty of Christ was perceived and declared, not all at once, but step by step, and by the help of the old prophetic teaching." (*Introd. to the Gospel of St. John*, in the so-called "Speaker's Commentary," p. lxxxvii.) Canon Kennedy even says:—"I do not think that any apostle, John, or Peter, or Paul, was so taught the full $\mu \upsilon \sigma \tau \acute{\eta} \rho \iota o \nu \ \theta \varepsilon \acute{o} \tau \eta \tau o \varsigma$ as that they were prepared to formulate the decrees of Nicæa and Constantinople, which appeared after 300 years and more, or the Trinitarian exegesis, which was completed after 600 years and more. But they, with the other evangelists, guided by the Holy Spirit, furnished the materials from which those doctrines were developed." (*Ely Lectures*, p. xix.)

Taking all these facts into consideration, is it probable that at this early day the Jewish Christians and Gentile believers at Rome, who needed so much instruction in the very elements of Christianity, were already so fully initiated into the mysterious doctrine of the deity of Christ, that the application of the term God to him, found in no Christian writing that we know of till long after the date of this Epistle, could have been familiar to them ? Accustomed to the representation of him as a being distinct from God, would they not have been startled and amazed beyond measure by finding him described as "over all, God blessed for ever"?—But if so, if this was a doctrine and a use of language with which they were not familiar, it is to me wholly incredible that the Apostle should have introduced it abruptly in this incidental manner, and have left it without remark or explanation.

Dr. Hermann Schultz, whose elaborate dissertation on Rom. ix. 5 has been already referred to, admits that if $\dot{\varepsilon}\pi\grave{\iota}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \theta\varepsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ was used

authority for Jewish opinions in the time of Christ. See Ginsburg, *The Kabbalah* (Lond. 1865), p. 78 ff., espec. p. 90 ff.—One who is disposed to rely on Hengstenberg's *Christology* in relation to this subject, should compare the review of it by Dr. Noyes in the *Christian Examiner* (Boston) for Jan., May, and July, 1836.

here to designate the λόγος, the eternal Son of God, in other words, if θεός was used here in reference to the nature of Christ, "the strict monotheism of Paul would certainly require an intimation that the honor due to God alone was not here trenched upon" (*beeinträchtigt*).* The expression, he maintains, describes "the dignity conferred upon him by God"; the θεός here is essentially equivalent to κύριος. "The predicate θεός must be perfectly covered by the subject Χριστός, i. e. the Messianic human King of Israel."†

But these concessions of Schultz seem to me fatal to his construction of the passage. If θεός used in the metaphysical sense, describing the *nature* of Christ, would confessedly need explanation, to guard against an apparent infringement of the Divine unity, would not Paul's readers need to be cautioned against taking it in this sense, the sense which it has everywhere else in his writings?—Again, if Paul by θεός here only meant κύριος, why did he not say κύριος, this being his constant designation of the glorified Christ (comp. Phil. ii. 9–11)?

This leads me to notice further the important passage 1 Cor. viii. 6, already quoted (see above, p. 121). It has often been said that the mention here of the Father as the "one God" of Christians no more excludes Christ from being God and from receiving this name, than the designation of Christ as the "one Lord" excludes the Father from being Lord and receiving this name. But in making this statement some important considerations are overlooked. In the first

---

*Schultz, *Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theol.*, 1868, xiii. 484.

†This view of Schultz appears to be that of Hofmann (*Der Schrift-beweis*, 2te Aufl., 1857, i. 143) and Weiss (*Bibl. Theol. d. N. T.*, 3te Aufl., 1880, p. 283, note 5), as it was formerly of Ritschl (*Die Entsteh-ung der altkath. Kirche*, 2te Aufl., 1857, p. 79, f.). This is the way a'so in which the old Socinian commentators understood the passage, as Socinus, Crell, Schlichting, Wolzogen. They did not hesitate to give the name "God" to Christ, any more than the ancient Arians did, under-standing it in a lower sense, and referring especially in justification of this to John x. 34–36, and various passages of the Old Testament. So it appears to have been taken by some of the Ante-Nicene Fathers who referred the last clause of the verse to Christ, as probably by Novatian, who quotes the passage twice as proof that Christ is *Deus* (*De Regula Fidei* or *De Trin*. cc. 13, 30), but who says "Dominus et Deus *consti-tutus* esse reperitur" (c. 20); "hoc ipsum *a Patre proprio consecutus*, ut omnium et Deus esset et Dominus esset" (c. 22); "omnium Deus, quoniam omnibus illum *Deus Pater praeposuit* quem genuit" (c. 31). So Hippolytus (*Cont. Noët*. c. 6) applies the verse to Christ, and justifies the language by quoting Christ's declaration, "All things have been delivered to me by the Father." He cites other passages in the same connection, and says: "If then all things have been subjected unto him with the exception of Him who subjected them, he rules over all, *but the Father rules over him*."

place, the title "god" is unquestionably of far higher dignity than the title "lord"; and because godship *includes* lordship with all the titles that belong to it, it by no means follows that lordship includes godship and has a right to its titles; in other words, that one who is properly called a *lord* (κύριος), as having servants or subjects or possessions, may therefore be properly called a *god* (θεός).   In the second place, the lordship of Christ is everywhere represented not as belonging to him by *nature*, but as conferred upon him by the one God and Father of all.   This lordship is frequently denoted by the figurative expression, "sitting on the right hand of God."*   The expression is borrowed from Ps. cx., so often cited in the New Testament as applicable to Christ, and particularly by Peter in his discourse on the day of Pentecost, who, after quoting the words, "The Lord [*Jehovah*] said unto my Lord [*Adoni*], 'Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool,'" goes on to say, "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath MADE him both *Lord* and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified" (Acts ii. 35, 36).   It is he to whom "all authority was *given* in heaven and on earth," whom "*God exalted* with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour"; "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . *put all things in subjection* under his feet, and *gave* him to be head over all things to the Church"; "*gave* unto him the name which is above every name . . . that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is *Lord*, to the glory of God, the Father."   Such being Paul's conception of the relation of Christ to God, is it not the plain meaning of the passage, that while the heathen worship and serve many beings whom they call "gods" and "lords," to Christians there is but one God, the Father,—one being to whom they give that name, "from whom are all things," and who is the subject of supreme worship; and one being "through whom are all things," through whom especially flow our spiritual blessings, whom "God hath made both Lord and Christ, and whom Christians therefore habitually call "the Lord."   The fact that this appellation of Christ, under such circumstances, does not debar the Supreme Being from receiving the name "Lord," obviously affords no countenance to the notion that Paul would not hesitate to give to Christ the name "God."   As a matter of fact "the Lord" is the common designation of Christ in the writings of Paul, and is seldom used of God, except in quotations from or references to the

---

* See Knapp, *De Jesu Christo ad dextram Dei sedente*, in his *Scripta varii Argumenti*, ed. 2da (1823), i. 39–76.

language of the Old Testament.*   There, in the Septuagint, $K\acute{v}\rho\iota\sigma\varsigma$ is used of God sometimes as a proper name, taking the place of Jehovah (Yahweh), on account of a Jewish superstition, and sometimes as an appellative.

GLANCING back now, for a moment, over the field we have traversed, we may reasonably say, it seems to me, *first*, that the use of $\varepsilon\grave{v}\lambda o\gamma\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, elsewhere in the New Testament restricted to God, the Father,—in connection with the exceeding rarity, if not absence, of ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving to Christ in the writings of Paul, and their frequency in reference to God,—affords a pretty strong presumption in favor of that construction of this ambiguous passage which makes the last clause a doxology to the Father; *secondly*, that some additional confirmation is given to this reference by the $\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ $\theta\varepsilon\grave{o}\varsigma$ $\varkappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\pi\alpha\tau\grave{\eta}\rho$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$, $\acute{o}$ $\grave{\varepsilon}\pi\grave{\iota}$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$, in Eph. iv. 6; and *thirdly*, that the at first view overwhelming presumption in favor of this construction, founded on the uniform restriction of the designation $\theta\varepsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, occurring more than five hundred times, to God, the Father, in the writings of Paul, is not weakened, but rather strengthened, by our examination of the language which he elsewhere uses respecting the dignity of Christ and his relation to God.   And though our sources of information are imperfect, we have seen that there are very grave reasons for doubting whether the use of $\theta\varepsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ as a designation of Christ belonged to the language of Christians anywhere, at so early a period as the date of this Epistle (cir. A. D. 58).

Beyond a doubt, all the writers of the New Testament, and the early preachers of Christianity, believed that God was *united with* the man Jesus Christ in a way unique and peculiar, distinguishing him from all other beings; that his teaching and works and character were divine; that God had raised him from the dead, and exalted him to be a Prince and a Saviour; that he came, as the messenger of God's love and mercy, to redeem men from sin, and make them truly sons of God; that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."   But no New Testament writer has *defined the mode* of this union with God.   How much real light has been thrown upon the subject by the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, and the so-called Athanasian Creed, is a question on which there may be differences of opinion.   The *authority* of councils is another question.   But it has been no part of my object in

---

* "On the meaning of $K\Upsilon PIO\Sigma$ in the New Testament, particularly on the manner in which this word is employed by Paul in his Epistles," see the valuable article of Prof. Stuart in the *Biblical Repository* (Andover) for Oct. 1831, i. 733-776.   His view is that the $\varkappa v\rho\iota\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ which Christ has as the Messiah is a delegated dominion.

discussing the construction of the passage before us, to argue against the doctrine of the Nicene Creed; my point is simply the *use of language* at the time when this Epistle was written. The questions of doctrine and language are of course closely connected, but are not identical. It seems to me that a believer in the deity of Christ, admitting the fact that we have no clear evidence that the "mediator between God and men" was ever *called* "God" by any New Testament writer, or any very early preacher of Christianity, may recognize therein a wise providence which saved the nascent Church from controversies and discussions for which it was not then prepared.

III. WE will now consider some other constructions of the passage before us. (See above, p. 89 f.)

1. I refrain from discussing in detail the comparative merits of Nos. 1 and 2. The advocates of No. 1 observe, correctly, that it describes Christ as only ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, not ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, which they say would identify him with the Father. But if the Father is "God over all," and Christ is also "God over all," the question naturally arises, how the Father can be "*the* God over all," unless the term "God" as applied to Christ is used in a lower sense. The answers to this question would lead us beyond the sphere of exegesis, and I pass it by. Meyer thinks that if we refer the ὁ ὤν to Christ this is the most natural construction of the words, and it seems to have been adopted by most of the ancient Fathers who have cited the passage, at least after the Council of Nicæa, and in nearly all the generally received modern translations, from Luther and Tyndale downwards.

2. Construction No. 2 aims to escape the difficulty presented by No. 1, but involves some ambiguities. Does the sentence mean, "who is over all (Jews as well as Gentiles), and who is also God blessed for ever" (so Hofmann, Kahnis, *Die luth. Dogm.* i. 453 f.)? or does it mean "celui qui est élevé sur toutes choses, comme Dieu béni éternellement"? as Godet translates it (*Comm.* ii. 256), contending that ἐπὶ πάντων is not to be connected with θεός, but with ὤν, though he had before translated, inconsistently it would seem, "lui qui est Dieu au-dessus de toutes choses béni éternellement" (pp. 248, 254). Lange finds in the last clause "a quotation from the synagogical liturgy," together with "a strong Pauline breviloquence," the ellipsis in which he supplies in a manner that must always hold a high place among the curiosities of exegesis. He says, however, that "every exposition is attended with great difficulties." I cannot discover that "God blessed for ever" as a kind of compound name of the Supreme Being occurs in Jewish liturgies or anywhere else.

3. Construction No. 3 is defended particularly by Gess, who maintains in opposition to Schultz and others that θεός here "nicht Christi Machtstellung sondern seine Wesenheit bezeichnet." (*Christi Person und Werk*, II. i. 207.) But on this supposition he admits that the connecting of θεός with ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων would present a serious difficulty. "The care with which Paul elsewhere chooses his expressions in such a way that the supreme majesty of the Father shines forth would be given up." Meyer thinks that the punctuation adopted by Morus and Gess makes "die Rede" "noch zerstückter, ja kurzathmiger" than construction No. 5. But this is rather a matter of taste and feeling. The objections which seem to me fatal to all the constructions which refer the name θεός here to Christ have been set forth above, and need not be repeated.

If the view of Westcott and Hort is correct, the construction of this passage adopted by Hippolytus (*Cont. Noët.* c. 6) agrees with that of Gess in finding three distinct affirmations in the clause beginning with ὁ ὢν, in opposition to those who would read it μονοκώλως. But the passage in Hippolytus is obscure. See below, under IV.

4. Under No. 4 I have noticed a possible construction, for which, as regards the essential point, I have referred to Wordsworth's note, in his *N. T. in Greek*, new ed., vol. ii. (1864). He translates, in his note on ver. 5: "He that is existing above all, God Blessed for ever," and remarks: "There is a special emphasis on ὁ ὢν. He that *is;* He Who is the *being One;* JEHOVAH. See John i. 18; Rev. i. 4, 8; iv. 8; xi. 17; xvi. 5, compared with Exod. iii. 14, ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ ὢν. And compare on Gal. iii. 20." . . . "He Who *came* of the Jews, according to the *flesh*, is no other than ὁ ὢν, the BEING ONE, JEHO-VAH." . . . We have an assertion of "His *Existence* from Everlasting, in ὁ ὢν." He mistranslates the last part of Athanasius, *Orat. cont. Arian.* i. § 24, p. 338, thus: "*Paul* asserts that He is the splendour of His Father's Glory, and is the Being One, over all, God Blessed for ever." In his note on ver. 4, 5, on the other hand, he translates the present passage: "Christ came, Who is over all, God Blessed for ever."

There is some confusion here. The verb εἰμί may denote simple existence; it may (in contrasts) denote *real* in distinction from *seem-ing* existence; it may be, and commonly is, used as a mere copula, connecting the subject with the predicate. As applied to the Supreme Being in Exod. iii. 14 (Sept.), Wisd. Sol. xiii. 1, etc., ὁ ὢν, "He who Is," describes him as possessing not only real, but independent and hence eternal existence. This latter use is altogether peculiar. To find it where ὢν is used as a *copula*, or to suppose that the two

uses can be combined, is purely fanciful and arbitrary. It was not
too fanciful and arbitrary, however, for some of the Christian Fathers,
who argue Christ's eternal existence from the use of ὤν or ὁ ὤν (or
qui est) in such passages as John i. 18; iii. 13 (t. r.); vi. 46; Rom.
ix. 5; Heb. i. 3. So Athanasius, as above; Epiphanius, *Ancorat.* c.
5; Gregory of Nyssa, *Adv. Eunom.* lib. x., Opp. (1638) ii. 680–82;
Pseudo-Basil, *Adv. Eunom.* iv. 2, Opp. i. 282 (399); Chrysostom,
Opp. 1. 476 f., viii. 87, ed. Montf.; Hilary, *De Trin.* xii. 24. So
Proclus of Constantinople, *Ep. ad Armen. de Fide* c. 14, quoting
Rom. ix. 5, says: εἶπεν αὐτὸν ὄντα, ἵνα ἄναρχον βροντήσῃ; "he spoke
of him as *being*, that he might declare in thunder his existence with-
out beginning." (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* lxv. 872ᶜ.)

5.   The construction, "from whom is the Messiah as to the flesh,
he who is over all: God be blessed for ever !", has found favor with
some eminent scholars (see below under IV.), and deserves conside-
ration.   If adopted, I think we should understand ὁ ὤν ἐπὶ πάντων
not as meaning "he who is superior to all the patriarchs" (Justi and
others), which is tame, and would hardly be expressed in this way;
nor "he who is over all things," which, without qualification, seems
too absolute for Paul; but rather, "who is Lord of *all* (Jews and
Gentiles alike), comp. Acts x. 36; Rom. x. 12; xi. 32; who, though
he sprang from the Jews, is yet, as the Messiah, the ruler of a king-
dom which embraces all men.   (See Wetstein's note, near the end.)
The natural contrast suggested by the mention of Christ's relation to
the Jews κατὰ σάρκα, may justify us in assuming this reference of
πάντων, which also accords with the central thought of the Epistle.
The doxology, however, seems exceedingly abrupt and curt; and we
should expect ὁ θεός instead of θεός as the subject of the sentence,
though in a few cases the word stands in the nominative without the
article.   Grimm compares θεὸς μάρτυς, 1 Thess. ii. 5, with μάρτυς ὁ
θεός, Rom. i. 9; also 2 Cor. v. 19; Gal. ii. 6; vi. 7; Luke xx. 38 (?).
We should also rather expect εὐλογητός to stand first in the doxology;
but the position of words in Greek is so largely subjective, depending
on the feeling of the writer, that we cannot urge this objection very
strongly.   The thought, so frequent in Paul, of God as the *source*, in
contrast with, or rather in distinction from, Christ as the *medium* of
the Messianic blessings, may have given the word θεός prominence.
(See above, p. 108 f., in regard to the position of the subject in con-
trasts.)   Gess accordingly dismisses the objection founded on the
position of εὐλογητός, remarking, "die Voranstellung von θεός hätte
durch den Gegensatz gegen Christum ein zureichendes Motiv" (*ubi*

supra, p. 206).   Still, on the whole, construction No. 7 seems to me
much easier and more natural.

6.   The construction numbered 6 was, I believe, first proposed by
Professor Andrews Norton, in his review of Prof. Stuart's *Letters to Dr.
Channing*.   This was published in the *Christian Disciple* (Boston) for
1819, new series, vol. i. p. 370 ff.; on Rom. ix. 5 see p. 418 ff.   The
passage is discussed more fully in his *Statement of Reasons*, &c.
Cambridge and Boston, 1833, p. 147 ff.; new ed. (ster. 1856), p. 203
ff. 470 ff., in which some notes were added by the writer of the
present essay.   There, after giving as the literal rendering, "He
who was over all was God, blessed for ever," Mr. Norton remarks:
" ' He who was over all,' that is, over all which has just been men-
tioned by the Apostle." . . .   "Among the privileges and distinctions
of the Jews, it could not be forgotten by the Apostle, that God had
presided over all their concerns in a particular manner."

There is no grammatical objection to this construction of the pas-
sage.   (See above, p. 99, 1st paragr.)   Mr. Norton, in translating
ver. 4 and 5, uses the *past* tense in supplying the ellipsis of the sub-
stantive verb.   This is done by other translators, e. g. Conybeare
and Howson.   It may be questioned, however, whether this is fully
justified here.   Canon Kennedy uses the present tense, but seems to
take the same general view of the bearing of the passage as Mr.
Norton.   See his *Occasional Sermons*, pp. 64, 65, and *Ely Lectures*,
pp. 88, 89.

As regards this view of the passage, I will only say here, that the
thought presented in Mr. Norton's translation did not need to be
expressed, as it is fully implied in the nature of the privileges and
distinctions enumerated.   (See above, p. 94.)   Taking Professor
Kennedy's rendering, I doubt whether the Apostle would have used
this language in respect to the relation existing between God and the
Jewish people at the time when he was writing.   The Jews gloried in
God as their God in a special sense (Rom. ii. 17); but in Paul's
view it was *Christians*, now, who rightfully gloried in God through our
Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. v. 11; comp. iii. 29).

7.   I add a single remark, which might more properly have been
made before.   I have rendered ὁ χριστός here not "Christ," as a
mere proper name, but "the Messiah."   Not only the use of the
article, but the context, seems to me to require this.   Westcott and
Hort observe in regard to the word χριστός: "We doubt whether the
appellative force, with its various associations and implications, is
ever entirely lost in the New Testament, and are convinced that the
number of passages is small in which Messiahship, of course in the

enlarged apostolic sense, is not the principal intention of the word."
(*The N. T. in Greek*, vol. ii., *Introd.*, p. 317.)

IV. WE will now take notice of some points connected with the
history of the interpretation of Rom. ix. 5. The fullest account of
this is perhaps that given by Schultz in the article already repeatedly
referred to; but he is neither very thorough nor very accurate.

The application of the passage by the Christian Fathers will natur-
ally come first under consideration.

The fact that the great majority of the Fathers whose writings have
come down to us understood the last part of the verse to relate to
Christ has been regarded by many as a very weighty argument in favor
of that construction. I have before had occasion to consider the
value of this argument in connection with another passage. (See
above, p. 8.) The remarks there made apply equally to the present
case. The fact that the Fathers in quoting a passage grammatically
ambiguous have given it a construction which suited their theology,
does not help us much in determining the true construction. We
must remember also the looser use of the term $\theta\varepsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ which prevailed
in the latter part of the second century and later. (See above, p.
120 f.) Those in the second and third centuries who held strongly
the doctrine of the inferiority of the Son, and the Arians in the
fourth, like the Socinians at a later period, did not hesitate to apply
the name "God" to Christ, and would find little difficulty in a con-
struction of the passage which involved this. They might hesitate
about the expression "God over all;" but, as we have seen, though
natural, it is not necessary to connect the $\dot{\varepsilon}\pi\grave{\iota} \pi\acute{a}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ with $\theta\varepsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$.

The specimen of patristic exegesis in the construction given to 2
Cor. iv. 4, where so many of the Fathers make the genitive $\tau o\tilde{\upsilon} a\grave{\iota}\tilde{\omega}\nu o\varsigma$
depend not on $\acute{o} \theta\varepsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, but $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu \dot{a}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\nu$ (see above, p. 8), will be suffi-
cient for most persons who wish to form an estimate of their authority
in a case like the present. I will only ask further, taking the first
examples that occur to me, how much weight is to be attributed to
the judgment of Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodoret,
Isidore of Pelusium, Gennadius, Theodorus Monachus, Joannes
Damascenus (?), Photius, Œcumenius (or what passes under his
name), and Theophylact, when, in their zeal for the freedom of the
will, they explain $\pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\varepsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in Rom. viii. 28 ($\tau o\tilde{\iota}\varsigma \kappa a\tau\grave{a} \pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\varepsilon\sigma\iota\nu \varkappa\lambda\eta\tau o\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$),
not as denoting the Divine purpose, but the purpose or choice of the
subjects of the call?" (Cyril of Alexandria gives the words both
meanings at the same time.) What is the value of the opinion of
Chrysostom, Joannes Damascenus, Œcumenius, and Theophylact

that διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Rom. xvi. 27 is to be construed with στη-ρίξαι in ver. 25 ?   Shall we accept the exegesis of Chrysostom and Theophylact when they tell us that in the injunction of Christ in Matt. v. 39 not to resist τῷ πονηρῷ, τῷ πονηρῷ means the devil ?

Dean Burgon, in his article on "New Testament Revision" in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1882, has given perhaps the fullest enumeration yet presented of Christian writers who have referred the ὁ ὤν κ. τ. λ. in Rom. ix. 5 to Christ.   He counts up "55 illustrious names," 40 of Greek writers from Irenæus in the latter part of the second century to John of Damascus in the eighth, and 15 of Latin writers, from Tertullian at the beginning of the third century to Facundus in the sixth, "who all see in Rom. ix. 5 a glorious asser-tion of the eternal Godhead of CHRIST."   An examination of his list will show that it needs some sifting.   Most of the Latin writers whom he mentions, as Augustine, knew little or nothing of Greek, and their authority cannot be very weighty in determining the construction of an ambiguous Greek sentence.   Of his illustrious names 6 are unfor-tunately unknown, being writers, "of whom," as Mr. Burgon mildly puts it, "3 have been mistaken for Athanasius, and 3 for Chrysos-tom."   Another is the illustrious forger of the Answers to Ten Ques-tions of Paul of Samosata, fathered upon Dionysius of Alexandria, "certainly spurious," according to Cardinal Newman and the best scholars generally, and marked as pseudonymous by Mr. Burgon him-self.   Cæsarius should also have been cited as Pseudo-Cæsarius. Among the other illustrious names we find "6 of the Bishops at the Council of Antioch, A. D. 269."   On looking at the names as they appear in Routh's *Rell. Sacrae*, ed. alt. (1846), iii. 289, I regret my inability to recall the deeds or the occasion that made them "illus-trious," unless it is the fact that, as members of that Council, about half a century before the Council of Nicæa, they *condemned* the use of the term ὁμοούσιος, "consubstantial," which was established by the latter as the test and watchword of orthodoxy.

Next to the six Bishops and "ps.-Dionysius Alex." in Mr. Bur-gon's list of the illustrious Fathers "who see in Rom. ix. 5 a glo-rious assertion of the eternal Godhead of Christ," we find "Constt. App.," that is, the Apostolical Constitutions, with a reference to "vi. c. 26."   He does not quote the passage.   It reads as follows:—"Some of the heretics imagine the Christ [so Lagarde; or "the Lord," Cotelier and Ueltzen] to be a mere man   .   .   .   ; but others of them suppose that Jesus himself is the God over all, glorifying him as his own Father, supposing him to be Son and Paraclete; than which docrines what can be more abominable ?"   Compare Const.

Apost. iii. 17:—"The Father is the God over all, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός; Christ is the only-begotten God, the beloved Son, the Lord of glory." See also vi. 18.

One is surprised, after this, to find that Mr. Burgon did not cite for the same purpose Pseudo-Ignatius *ad Tars.* cc. 2, 5, and *ad Philip.* c. 7, where it is denied emphatically that Christ is ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός; and also Origen, *Cont. Cels.* viii. 14, who says:—"Grant that there are some among the multitude of believers, with their differences of opinion, who rashly suppose that the Saviour is the Most High God over all; yet certainly we do not; for we believe him when he said, *The Father who sent me is greater than I.*" The very strong language which Origen uses in many other places respecting the inferiority of the Son, renders it unlikely that he applied the last part of this verse to Christ. See, e. g. *Cont. Cels.* viii. 15; *De Princip.* i. 3. § 5; *In Ioan.* tom. ii. cc. 2, 3, 6; vi. 23; xiii. 25. Rufinus's Latin version of Origen's Comm. on Romans, which is the only authority for ascribing to Origen the common interpretation of this passage, is no authority at all. He, according to his own account of his work, had so transformed it by omissions, additions, and alterations, that his friends thought he ought to claim it as his own.* It was in accordance with his professed principles to omit or alter in the works which he translated whatever he regarded as dangerous, particularly whatever did not conform to his standard of orthodoxy. His falsification of other writings of Origen is notorious. Westcott and Hort remark that in the Rufino-Origenian commentary on this verse "there is not a trace of Origenian language, and this is one of the places in which Rufinus would not fail to indulge his habit of altering an interpretation which he disapproved on doctrinal grounds." They also remark, "it is difficult to impute Origen's silence to accident in the many places in which quotation would have been natural had he followed the common interpretation."

Origen should therefore be henceforth excluded from the list of Fathers cited in support of the common punctuation. It is even "probable," as Westcott and Hort maintain, though "not certain," that he and Eusebius gave the passage a different construction.

---

*See his *Peroratio* at the end of the Epistle; Origenis *Opp.* iv. 688 f., ed. Delarue. Matthaei remarks: "Rufini interpretatio, quæ parum fidei habet, in epistola ad Romanos, quod quilibet ipse intelligit, non tam pro Origenis opere, quam pro compendio Rufini haberi debet, quod haud dubie alia omisit, alia, sicut in ceteris libris, invito Origene admisit."—*Pauli Epp. ad Thess.*, etc. (Rigae, 1785), Praefatio, sig. b 2. See more fully to the same purpose Redepenning's *Origenes*, ii. 189 ff., who speaks of his "Ausscheidung ganzer Stücke," and "Umgestaltung des Heterodoxen in der Trinitätslehre."

As regards Eusebius, the presumption is perhaps even stronger than in the case of Origen. He has nowhere quoted the passage; but in very numerous places in his writings he uses ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός as a title exclusively belonging to the Father, and insists upon this against the Sabellians.* I admit that these considerations are not decisive; he and Origen may have given the passage an interpretation similar to that of Hippolytus; but if they understood it to relate to Christ it is certainly strange that they have nowhere quoted it in their numerous writings.

The assumption that Irenæus referred the last part of this verse to Christ must be regarded as doubtful. The only place where he has quoted it is *Haer.* iii. 16. (al. 18.) § 3, where his text is preserved only in the old Latin version, which of course cannot determine the construction which Irenæus put upon the Greek. He does not quote it to prove that Christ is θεός; the Gnostics gave the name θεός to their Æons, and also to the Demiurgus; but to prove the unity of the *Christ* with the man Jesus, in opposition to the Gnostics who maintained that the Æon Christ did not descend upon Jesus till his baptism. He had just before (§ 2) quoted Matt. i. 18 for this purpose (reading τοῦ δὲ χριστοῦ); he now quotes Rom. i. 3, 4; ix. 5; and Gal. iv. 4, 5, for the same purpose. His argument rests on the ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, and not on the last part of the verse, on which he makes no remark. Throughout his work against Heresies, and very often, Irenæus uses the title "the God over all" as the exclusive designation of the Father."†

The passage in which Hippolytus quotes Rom. ix. 5 (*Cont. Noël.* c. 6) has already been noticed. (See above, pp. 126, 130.). The Noetians and Patripassians, according to him, quoted the text to prove the identity of Christ with the Father. (*Ibid.* cc. 2, 3.) He complains that they treat the words μονοχώλως (or μονόχωλα); comp. Epiph. *Haer.* lvii. 2. Westcott and Hort understand this to mean

---

*See, for example, *De Eccl. Theol.* i. 3, 7, 8, 11, 20; ii. 1, 4, 5 (pp. 62 c, 65 a, 66 c, 70 d, 93 c, 104 a, 107 c d), and a multitude of other places, some of which are quoted in Wetstein's note. The apparent exception, *Hist. Eccl.* viii. 11, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν χριστὸν ἐπιβοωμένους (ed. Vales.), is a false reading: Burton, Schwegler, Læmmer and Dindorf omit χριστόν on the authority of important MSS.; on the other hand Heinichen in his recent edition (1868) omits ἐπὶ πάντων θεόν, and reads τὸν χριστόν simply.

†Semler, *Ep. ad Griesbachium*, 1770, p. 77 ff.; *Antwort* etc. 1770, p. 45), and Whitby (*Disq. modestæ*, p. 125 f.) take the above view of this passage of Irenæus. For the use of the designation "God over all," see Iren. *Haer.* ii. 5. § 4; 6. (al. 5.) §§ 2. 3; 11. (al. 12.) § 1 *bis*; 13. (al. 18.) § 8; 24. (al. 41.) § 2; 28. (al. 49.) § 8; iii. 8. § 3; iv. 5. (al. 10.) § 1; v. 18. § 1, and many other passages.

that they read all the words from καὶ ἐξ ὧν to αἰῶνας "as a single clause." Semler once took nearly the same view (*Hist. Einl.* zu S. J. Baumgarten's *Unters. theol. Streitigkeiten*, 1762, i. 217, n. 205), but was afterwards doubtful about it (*ibid.* p. 236, n. 235). Fabricius in his note on the passage, and Salmond in his translation of Hippolytus in the *Ante-Nicene Christ. Library* ix. 53, give a very different explanation. To discuss the matter here would require too much space, but it seemed well to mention it. Possibly in *Cont. Noët.* c. 6 εὐλογητός is misplaced through the mistake of a scribe, and should stand before εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Dean Burgon refers also to "Phil. 339," that is to the *Philosophumena* or *Ref. omn. Haer.* x. 34, *ad fin.* But ὁ κατὰ πάντων θεός there should not, I think, be alleged as a quotation of Rom. ix. 5 applied to Christ. Bunsen's easy emendation of the passage (*Anal. Ante-Nic.* i. 392; comp. his *Hippolytus*, 2d ed., i. 413) seems to me the true reading, and is supported by x. 33 *ad init.* (p. 334), where οὗτος μόνος καὶ κατὰ πάντων θεός is distinguished from the Logos. Hippolytus could hardly have called Christ "*the* God over all."

I note in passing that Tischendorf cites incorrectly for the reference of the ὁ ὢν &c. to Christ "Meth. conviv 805 (Gall 3)." The passage referred to is not from the *Convivium*, but from the discourse of the Pseudo-Methodius *De Simeone et Anna*, c. 1 *ad fin.*, where we have the mere expression τῆς ἀστέκτου δόξης τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ συγκατάβασιν. This is also one of Dean Burgon's authorities; but, as the writer explains himself (c. 2 *ad fin.*), he seems to mean by "the glory of the God over all" not the glory of the Son considered by himself, but the glory of the whole Trinity. There is no quotation of Rom. ix. 5 here.

The passage of Amphilochius (Gallandi vi. 409, or Migne xxxix. 101) which Tischendorf adduces, with a *videtur*, as a reference of Rom. ix. 5 to the Father, seems analogous to the above, and hardly proves anything on one side or the other.

In the quotation of Rom. ix. 5 in the Antiochene Epistle to Paul of Samosata (see above, p. 134) it is probable that the six Bishops made a slight pause at πάντων. The subordination of the Son is very strongly expressed in the Epistle. Among other things it is said, "To think that the God of the universe is called a messenger (ἄγγελον) is impious; but the Son is the messenger of the Father, being himself Lord and God." (Routh, *ut supra*, p. 294.)

The Emperor Julian has already been referred to. (See above, p. 98, note.) He was as good a judge of the construction of a Greek sentence as Cyril of Alexandria, or any other of the Fathers, and

quite as likely to interpret impartially. Well acquainted with the writings of the Christians, he could hardly have overlooked passages so frequently quoted in the controversies on the nature of Christ as Rom. ix. 5 and Tit. ii. 13. But he did not find the title θεός given to Christ in these or any other places (e. g., 1 Tim. iii. 16) in the writings of Paul.

Among the orthodox Greek Fathers, Diodorus (of Antioch and Tarsus) and Photius appear to have understood the ὁ ὤν, &c., to refer to God. The comment of Diodorus on this passage is preserved in the important Catena on the Epistle to the Romans published by Cramer from a MS. in the Bodleian Library (Cramer's *Catenæ in N. T.* vol. iv. Oxon. 1844). The essential part of it reads:—καὶ τὸ μέγιστον, ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. ἐξ αὐτῶν, φησὶν, ὁ χριστός. Θεὸς δὲ οὐ μόνων αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ κοινῇ ἐπὶ πάντων ἐστὶ θεός. (p. 162.) This appears to mean, "From them, he says, is the Messiah. But God belongs not to them alone, but is God over all men alike." Meyer, Tholuck, Philippi, and Schultz understand it as relating to the Father. I do not perceive that this reference is affected by the fact that Theodore of Mopsuestia, a pupil of Diodorus, who has borrowed much of the language of this comment, gives the last part a different turn:—καὶ τὸ δὴ μέγιστον, ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὅς ἐστι θεὸς οὐ μόνον αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ κοινῇ πάντων. (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* lxvi. 833.) Had it been the purpose of Diodorus to express this meaning, he would probably have inserted ἐστιν after θεὸς δέ, or have written ὅς ἐστιν. The omission of the article before θεός creates no difficulty in taking θεός as the subject of the sentence. It is often omitted in such a case by these later Greek writers.*

Diodorus, it will be remembered, was the founder of a comparatively rational, grammatico-historical and logical school of interpretation, in opposition to the arbitrary exegesis of Scripture which had prevailed among the Fathers.

The passage in Photius (*Cont. Manich.* iii. 14) appears to be unequivocal:—"'He cries with a loud voice,—*whose are the covenants, and the laws* (αἱ νομοθεσίαι), *and the promises, and the holy services* (αἱ λατρεῖαι); and showing most clearly whence these things are, and on whose providence they have depended [he adds], ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν." "So the laws and the holy services and the promises, in the observance of which the fathers pleased God,

---

*See, for example, Theodore of Mopsuestia on Rom. ii. 15; viii. 28; ix. 10, 14 *bis*, 22-24, 25; xi. 2. (Migne, lxvi. coll. 789b, 832a, 833d, 836c, 840b, 841c, 841d, 852a.) See also Cramer, p. 11, l. 30; 15, l. 15; 27, l. 24; 54, l. 22, etc.

and from whom as to his humanity sprang the Messiah, are from the God over all, τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεοῦ." (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* cii. 157.)

Schultz, in the essay so often referred to (p. 480, note 2), says that Theodulus *in loc.* seems to refer the last part of our verse to God. He misapprehends the meaning of the passage in Theodulus, and does not observe that it is taken from Œcumenius.* The *Enarratio in Ep. ad Romanos* which, in a Latin translation, passes under the name of Theodulus, does not belong to the presbyter or bishop in Cœle-Syria of that name, who died A. D. 492, but is a very late Catena. (See Cave.)

A few words now respecting the Latin Fathers who have quoted Rom. ix. 5.

Tertullian is the first. He quotes it once as below, and once (*Prax.* c. 15) with *super omnia* before *deus.*† Cyprian simply cites the passage to prove that Christ is *deus* (*qui est super omnia deus benedictus in sæcula*), without remark. (*Testim.* ii. 6.) Novatian has already been spoken of. (See above, p. 126.)

I know of no trace of the reference of the last part of the verse to God among the Latin writers, except what may be implied in the language of the Pseudo-Ambrosius (Ambrosiaster), commonly identified with Hilary the deacon, in his commentary on the Epistle. He remarks:—"Si quis autem non putat de Christo dictum, *qui est Deus*, det personam de qua dictum est. De patre enim Deo hoc loco mentio facta non est." This is repeated in the commentary of Rabanus Maurus (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* cxi. col. 1482). The same in substance appears in the *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.*, qu. 91, formerly ascribed to Augustine, and printed in the Benedictine edition of his

---

*See *Biblioth. max. vet. Patrum*, viii. 605, or the *Monumenta S. Patrum Orthodoxographa* of Grynæus, ii. 1163.

†After remarking that he never speaks of Gods or Lords, but following the Apostle, when the Father and Son are to be named together, calls the Father God, and Jesus Christ Lord, he says:—"Solum autem Christum potero deum dicere, sicut idem apostolus. *Ex quibus Christus, qui est*, inquit, *deus super omnia benedictus in aevum omne.* Nam et radium solis seorsum solem vocabo; solem antem nominans, cuius est radius, non statim et radium solem appellabo." (*Prax.* c. 13, ed. Oehler.) This accords with his language elsewhere:—" Protulit deus sermonem . . . sicut radix fruticem, et fons fluvium, et sol radium." (*Prax.* c. 8.) "Cum radius ex sole porrigitur, portio ex summa; sed sol erit in radio . . . nec separatur substantia, sed extenditur." (*Apologet.* c. 21.) "Pater tota substantia est; filius vero derivatio totius et portio; sicut ipse profitetur, *Quia pater maior me est.*" (*Prax.* c. 9.) "Sermo deus, quia ex deo . . . Quodsi deus dei tanquam substantiva res, non erit ipse deus [αὐτόθεος], sed hactenus deus, qua ex ipsius substantia, ut portio aliqua totius." (*Prax.* c. 26.)

works, *Opp*. III. ii. 2915, ed. Bened. alt.: "Sed forte ad Patris personam pertinere dicatur. Sed hoc loco nulla est paterni nominis mentio. Ideoque si de Christo dictum negatur, persona cui competat detur."—This work is generally ascribed to the Hilary mentioned above.—The writer seems to have heard of those who interpreted the passage of God; and relying apparently upon the Latin version, he meets their interpretation of the Greek with a very unintelligent objection.

The Greek Fathers in Mr. Burgon's list who have not already been mentioned are the following:—Athanasius, Basil, Didymus, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Theodorus Mops., Eustathius, Eulogius, Theophilus Alex., Nestorius, Theodotus of Ancyra, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Amphilochius, Gelasius Cyz., Anastasius Ant., Leontius Byz., Maximus. Of the Latins, Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, Victorinus, the Breviarium, Marius Mercator, Cassian, Alcimus Avit., Fulgentius, Ferrandus.

"Against such a torrent of Patristic testimony," says Mr. Burgon, "it will not surely be pretended that the Socinian interpretation, to which our Revisionists give such prominence, can stand."

But to what does it all amount? Simply to the fact that a mass of writers, to the judgment of most of whom an intelligent scholar would attach very little weight in any question of exegesis, have followed that construction of an ambiguous passage which suited their theological opinions. Out of the whole list, the two, I suppose, who would be most generally selected as distinguished from the rest for sobriety and good sense in interpretation, are Chrysostom and Theodoret. Yet both of them adopted that excessively unnatural if not impossible construction of 2 Cor. iv. 4 of which I have spoken above. (See p. 8, also p. 133 f.)

The same general considerations apply to the ancient versions, some of which are ambiguous here, as Westcott and Hort remark, though the translators probably intended to have the last part of the verse understood of Christ.

(I now observe, too late for correction in the printed sheet, that, in citing the opinion of the eminent scholars just named respecting the construction given to Rom. ix. 5 by Origen and Eusebius, I have represented them as regarding it as "probable though not certain" that these Fathers understood the last clause as relating to God. Their note does imply that they are inclined to this view; but I now suppose that the words quoted were intended to apply to the Apostolic Constitutions and the Pseudo-Ignatius. Westcott and Hort also refer, for the application of the phrase ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός to the Father

in distinction from Christ, to 'Melito p. 413 Otto,' i. e. to his *Apol.*
fragm. 2; comp. Routh, i. 118 ed. alt.

WE will now dismiss the Fathers, and notice some facts belonging
to the more recent history of the interpretation of our passage.* I
notice the different constructions in the order in which they are num-
bered above, pp. 89, 90.

The three most important recent discussions of the passage outside
of the commentaries, before that of Dr. Dwight, are by Dr. Hermann
Schultz, in the *Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theol.*, 1868, pp. 462–506, who
defends constructions Nos. 1–3, with a slight preference for No. 1
(p. 483); Dr. C. L. Wilibald Grimm, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f.
wiss. Theol.*, 1869, pp. 311–322, who adopts No. 5; and Pastor Ernst
Harmsen, *ibid.* 1872, pp. 510–521, who adopts No. 7. There is a
brief discussion of the passage by Dr. G. Vance Smith, Canon Farrar,
and Dr. Sanday, in *The Expositor* for May, 1879, ix. 397–405, and
Sept., 1879, x. 232–238. There was a more extended debate in *The
Independent* (New York) for Aug. 12, Oct. 14, 21, 28, and Nov. 18,
1858, in which Dr. John Proudfit (anonymously), the Rev. Joseph
P. Thompson (the editor), Dr. Z. S. Barstow, and E. A. took part.

1–3. It would be idle to give a list of the supporters of Nos. 1–3,
who refer the clause in question to Christ. Among the commentators,
perhaps the more eminent and best known are Calvin, Beza, Ham-
mond, Le Clerc, Limborch, Bengel, Michaelis, Koppe, Flatt,
Tholuck, Olshausen, Stuart, Hodge, Philippi, Lange (with Schaff
and Riddle), Hofmann, Weiss, Godet, Alford, Vaughan, Sanday
(very doubtfully), Gifford. That the Roman Catholic commentators,
as Estius, Klee, Stengel, Reithmayr, Maier, Beelen, Bisping (not very
positively), Jatho, Klofutar (1880), should adopt this explanation, is
almost a matter of course. This construction of the verse is accepted
by all the *Fratres Poloni*, who did not hesitate to give the name God
to Christ, and to worship him, recognizing of course the supremacy
of the Father, to whom they applied the name God in a higher sense;

Literature.—The older literature is given by Wolf (*Curae*) and
Lilienthal (*Biblischer Archivarius*, 1745). For the more recent, see
Danz, and especially Schultz in the article so often referred to; also
among the commentators, Meyer and Van Hengel. E. F. C. Oertel
(*Christologie*, Hamb. 1792, p. 216 ff.) gives a brief account of the con-
troversy excited by Semler (1769–71); see also the works named by
Schultz, especially Hirt's *Orient. u. exeg. Bibliothek*, 1772, 1773. The
name Bremer (Schultz, p. 462, note 2) is a misprint for Benner.

so Socinus,* *Opp.* ii. 581, 582, 600 a; cf. ii. 377 f.; John Crell, *in loc.* *Opp.* i. 147; also *Respons. ad Grotium*, *Opp.* iv. 230 b; *De Uno Deo Patre*, p. 23 a; *De Deo ejusque Attrib.*, p. 35 b; *Eth. Christ.*, p. 348 a; Schlichting (*Lat.* Slichtingius), *Comm. post.* i. 254; Wolzogen, *Opp.* i. 710, 712; ii. 301; iii. 5; Sam. Przipcovius or Przpkowsky *in loc.*, p. 51. So also the Racovian Catechism, §§ 159, 160.

With a singular disregard of these historical facts, Dean Burgon holds up his hands in holy horror at the marginal renderings of the Revised New Testament at Rom. ix. 5, ascribed to "some modern Interpreters," and stigmatizes them as "*the Socinian gloss*"! (*Quar. Rev.*, Jan., 1882, p. 54.) The Italics are his. He seems throughout his article to imagine himself to be writing for readers who will take an opprobrious epithet for an argument. The real "Socinian gloss" is adopted, and the arguments for it are repeated, as we have seen, by the latest prominent defender of the construction which Mr. Burgon himself maintains; among English commentators compare Macknight on the passage.

A slight qualification, or supplement, of the above statement is, however, required. Schlichting, though he does not object to the common construction, misled by Erasmus, is inclined to suspect the genuineness of the word θεός. It is important in reference to the history of the interpretation of this passage, to observe that the statement of Erasmus in regard to the omission of this word in the quotations by some of the Fathers, led many astray, among others Grotius, who also incorrectly represents the word God as wanting in the Syriac version. Schoettgen misrepresented the case still worse, saying, by mistake of course, "Hoc verbum quamplurimi Codices, quidam etiam ex Patribus, non habent."

Schlichting also suggests, as what "venire alicui in mentem posset," the somewhat famous conjecture of ὧν ὁ for ὁ ὧν, but *rejects* it. It was taken up afterwards, however, by a man far inferior in judgment, Samuel Crell (not to be confounded with the eminent commentator), in the "*Initium Ev. S. Joannis restitutum*" (1726), published under the pseudonym of L. M. Artemonius. Its superficial

---

*Socinus speaks of the punctuation and construction proposed by Erasmus, a believer in the deity of Christ, which makes the ὁ ὧν, etc., a doxology to God, the Father, and says:—" Non est ulla causa, cur haec interpretatio, vel potius lectio et interpunctio Erasmi rejici posse videatur; nisi una tantum, quam Adversarii non afferunt; neque enim illam animadverterunt. Ea est, quod, cum simplex nomen Benedictus idem significat quod Benedictus sit, semper fere solet anteponi ei, ad quem refertur, perraro autem postponi."

Some of those who are so shocked at what they call "Socinian glosses," might perhaps learn a lesson of candor and fairness from this heretic.

plausibility seems to have fascinated many, among them Whitby (*Last Thoughts*), Jackson of Leicester (*Annot. ad Novat.* p. · 341), John Taylor of Norwich, Goadby, Wakefield (*Enquiry*), Bishop Edmund Law (Wakefield's *Memoirs*, i. 447), Belsham (*Epistles of Paul*), John Jones, and David Schulz (so says Baumgarten-Crusius).   Even Doddridge and Harwood speak of it as "ingenious," and Olshausen calls it "scharfsinnig." It does not deserve the slightest consideration.

Among the writers on Biblical Theology, Usteri (*Paulin. Lehrbegr.*, 5te Ausg., 1834, p. 324 f.) refers the clause in question to Christ, but strongly expresses his sense of the great difficulties which this involves.   He is influenced especially by Rückert (1831), who afterwards changed his mind.   Messner (1856, p. 236 f.) regards this reference as probable, though not certain; somewhat more doubtful is C. F. Schmid (2d ed., 1859, p. 540 f., or p. 475 f., Eng. trans.). Dorner in his recent work, *System der chirstl. Glaubenslehre* (1879), i. 345, only ventures to say that the reference to Christ is "the most natural."   Schott, August Hahn, De Wette, Reuss, Ritschl, are sometimes cited as supporting this construction; but later they all went over to the other side.   See below, under No. 7.

For the most elaborate defences of the construction we are considering, besides those which have already been mentioned, one may consult Dr. John Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, 5th ed. (1859), vol. ii. pp. 370–377, 401–405; and the commentaries of Flatt (from whom Prof. Stuart has borrowed largely) and Philippi.

4.   Construction No. 4 has already been sufficiently noticed.   (See above, p. 130.)

5.   The construction which puts a colon or a period after πάντων, making the clause beginning with θεός a doxology to God, seems to have been first suggested by ERASMUS in the Annotations to his 3d edition of the Greek Testament (1522), repeated in the 4th (1527). In his later writings, and in the note in his last edition (1535), while recognizing the possibility of this construction, he gave the preference to No. 7.*   It was adopted by LOCKE in his posthumous *Paraphrase*, etc. (Lond. 1705, and often):—"and of them, as to his fleshly extraction, Christ is come, he who is over all, God be blessed for ever, Amen."   Locke's construction was preferred by WETSTEIN in the important note on the passage in his Greek Testament, vol. ii. (1752), and was adopted by Prof. L. J. C. JUSTI in Paulus's *Memorabilien*, 1791, St. i. pp. 1–26; treated more fully in his *Vermischte Abhandlungen*, 2te Samml., 1798, pp. 309–346; also by E. F. C.

---

*Erasmi *Opp.*, Lugd. Bat. 1703 ff., vol. vi. 610 f.; ix. 1002 f., 1045 f.

OERTEL, *Christologie* (1792), p. 209 f.   He has a pretty full discussion of the passage (pp. 195–218).   So by G. L. BAUER, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.*, Bd. iv. (1802), pp. 10–14; and by C. F. AMMON, for though in his *Bibl. Theol.*, 2te Ausg. (1801), pp. 220–222, he does not decide between constructions No. 5 and No. 7, he favors the former in his note on the passage in the third edition of Koppe on Romans (1824). J. J. STOLZ adopts it in the 4th ed. of his *Uebersetzung des N. T.* (1804) and the 3d ed. of his *Erläuterungen* (1808), iii. 170–191.   He gives there an interesting extract from Semler's *Hist. u. krit. Sammlungen über die sogenannten Beweisstellen in der Dogmatik*, St. ii. pp. 284–287. So DE WETTE in the text of the 3d ed. of his German translation of the Bible (1839), though he gives constructions Nos. 1 and 7 as alternative renderings; in the note in the 4th and last edition of his commentary on the Epistle (1847), though undecided, he seems on the whole rather inclined to No. 7.   This construction (No. 5) is supported also by BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS, a scholar to be spoken of with high respect, in his *Comm.* on the Epistle (Jena, 1844), comp. his *Grundzüge der bibl. Theol.* (1828), p. 385 f., and his *Exeget. Schriften zum N. T.*, II. i. (Jena, 1844) p. 266, the latter cited by Ernesti. So by SCHUMANN in his *Christus* (1852), ii. 545, note; H. Fr. Th. L. ERNESTI, *Vom Ursprunge d. Sünde nach paulin. Lehrgehalte*, i. (1855) pp. 197–204; MÄRCKER (cited by Meyer), whose work I have not seen, and REUSS, *Les Epîtres pauliniennes* (1878), ii. 88.

The best defence of this view, perhaps, is to be found in the article of Grimm, referred to above.

6.   On construction No. 6 see above, p. 132.

7.   ERASMUS in his *translation* renders the words of the last part of our verse thus :—"et ii, ex quibus est Christus quantum attinet ad carnem, qui est in omnibus deus laudandus in secula, amen," which he perhaps intended for an ambiguous rendering, as *est* might be supplied after *laudandus*.   His *paraphrase* also seems ambiguous.*   Be this as it may, in the note in his last edition (1535), and in his later writings, he clearly indicates his preference for construction No. 7.†

---

*"At Christus sic est homo, ut idem et Deus sit, non huius aut illius gentis peculiaris, sed universorum Deus, et idem cum patre Deus, qui [Christus? pater? *or* Pater cum Christo?] praesidet omnibus, cuiusque inscrutabili consilio geruntur haec omnia, cui soli   .   .   .   debetur laus" &c.   One suggestion of Erasmus is that the word "God" in the last clause may denote the whole Trinity.

† See especially his *Apol. adv. monachos quosdam Hispanos* (written in 1528), *Opp.* ix. 1043–47:—"Ego coram Deo profiteor mihi videri *Paulum* hoc sensisse, quod modo significavimus, nec hunc sermonem proprie ad *Christum* pertinere, sed vel ad Patrem, vel ad totam Trinitatem" (col. 1045): comp. *Resp. ad Juvenem Gerontodidascalum* (writ-

Bucer (or Butzer) *in loc.* (1536?) as quoted by Wetstein, suggests this construction as an alternative rendering. Curcellæus (Courcelles) in his edition of the Greek Testament published in 1658 (also 1675, 85, 99) notes that "Quidam addunt punctum post vocem σάρκα. quia si id quod sequitur cum præcedentibus connecteretur, potius dicendum videatur ὅς ἐστι, vel ὅς ὤν, quam ὁ ὤν.

Others who have adopted or favored this construction are Whiston, in his *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, vol. iv. (1711), p. 13 ff.; Dr. Samuel Clarke, in his *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, Lond. 1712, 3d ed., 1732, p. 85 ff. He gives also as admissible constructions No. 5 and No. 2, but places No. 7 first. He was, as is well known, one of the best classical scholars of his day, as well as one of the ablest metaphysicians and theologians. So John Jackson of Leicester, in his *Annot. ad Novatianum* (1727), p. 341, though captivated by the specious but worthless conjecture of ὤν ὁ; Wetstein, as an alternative rendering, but rather preferring to place the stop after πάντων (see the end of his note); Semler, *Paraph. Ep. ad Rom.* (1769), p. 114 ff., and in many other writings; on the literature of the Semler controversy see the references given above, p. 141. Semler was not so well acquainted with the writings of the later, as with those of the earlier Fathers, and in this part of the field of debate his adversaries had the advantage. But he gave a stimulus to a freer and more impartial treatment of the question. Eckermann adopted the construction we are now considering in the *second* edition (1795) of his *Theologische Beyträge*, Bd. I. St. iii. pp. 160–162, though in the first edition he had opposed it.

Coming now to the present century, we find this construction adopted by the commentators C. F. Boehme (Lips. 1806), and H. E. G. Paulus, *Des Apostels Paulus Lehr-Briefe an die Galater- und Römer-Christen* (Heidelb. 1831), where he translates (p. 102): "Der über alle (Juden und Heiden) seyende Gott sey gepriesen auf (alle) die Zeitalter hinaus"; by Prof. J. F. Winzer of Leipzig in a *Programma* on Rom. ix. 1–5 (Lips. 1832), which I have not seen, but find highly praised; and Karl Schrader, *Der Apostel Paulus*, Theil iii. (1833), p. 75, and Theil iv. (1835), p. 355. He translates, "Der über Allem Seiende (der welcher über Allem ist,) Gott, gelobt (sei gelobt) in Ewigkeit!" It is adopted in three commentaries of remarkable independence and ability which appeared in 1834, namely

---

ten 1532), col. 1002:—"ipsa res loquitur, verba Pauli nullum sensum evidentius reddere quam hunc: *Deus, qui est super omnia, sit benedictus in secula.* Cui precationi accinitur, *Amen.*" See also above, under No. 5.

those of Prof. J. G. REICHE of Göttingen, whose note (Theil ii. pp.
268–278) is one of the fullest and best discussions of the passage,
though he makes some mistakes about the Fathers; Prof. Eduard
KOELLNER of Göttingen, and Dr. Conrad GLÖCKLER, whom Prof.
Stuart calls "a Nicenian" as regards his theological position.   In the
4th edition of K. G. BRETSCHNEIDER'S *Handbuch der Dogmatik* (1838)
i. 604 f., he adopts our construction, though in the earlier editions of
this work he had referred the θεός to Christ.   He translates: "Der
Herrüber alles, Gott, sei gepriesen in Ewigkeit."   In 1839, Prof L.
J. RÜCKERT of Jena, in the 2d edition of his elaborate and valuable
commentary (vol. ii. pp. 13–17) discusses the passage fully, and
though in the first edition (1831) he had strenuously contended for
the reference of the last part of the verse to Christ, now pronounces
the construction which makes it a doxology to God " far more prob-
able."   This year is also signalized in the history of the interpretation
of our passage by the publication of vol. ii. of the commentary of
Prof. C. F. A. FRITZSCHE of Rostock, who discusses the passage in a
masterly manner (pp. 260–275).   His translation has been given
above, p. 106.   In the 4th edition of his Greek Testament with a
Latin version, published in 1839, Prof. H. A. SCHOTT of Jena adopted
the punctuation and construction which make the clause beginning
with ὁ ὤν a doxology to God, though in previous editions he had fol-
lowed the common construction.   In his essay *De Invocatione Jesu
Christi Partic.* I. (1843), p. 8, thehighly esteemed commentator Dr.
Friedrich LÜCKE, Professor at Göttingen, refers the last part of our
verse to God.   Professor A. L. G. KREHL of Leipzig does the same
in his *Der Brief an die Römer ausgelegt* u. s. w. (1845), p. 322,
though in an earlier work, *Neutest. Handwörterbuch* (1843) art.
Christus, p. 114, he had cited Rom. ix. 5 in proof that Christ is
called God.

BAUR, who makes the passage a doxology to God, has some valu-
able remarks upon it in his *Paulus* (1845), p. 624 f., 2te Aufl.
(1866–67), ii. 263 f.; comp. his *Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit* (1841),
i. 84, note.   ZELLER agrees with him (*Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1842, p.
55).   So J. F. RÄBIGER, a believer in the divine nature of Christ, in
his *De Christologia Paulina contra Baurium Commentatio* (1852), pp.
26–28.

We may notice here the great commentators DE WETTE and MEYER.
De Wette, not perfectly satisfied with any view, yet wavers be-
tween constructions Nos. 5 and 7; see above under No. 5.   In his
Bibl. Dogmatik, 3te Aufl. (1831), p. 249, and in the 2d ed. of his
translation of the N. T., he had taken the name "God" here as a

designation of Christ; but in the 3d ed. of his translation he makes it begin a doxology.   MEYER in his *Das N. T. griechisch mit einer neuen Deutschen Uebersetzung* (1829) followed the common construction; but in the first edition of his *Comm.* (1836), and all later eds., he makes the passage a doxology to God.   His collaborator, HUTHER, maintains in his note on Tit. ii. 13 that the name *θεός* is not given to Christ in any of the New Testament Epistles.

In 1855 appeared the first edition of JOWETT's work on four of the Epistles of Paul (2d ed., 1859).   He translates: "God, who is over all, is blessed for ever. Amen."   So Bp. COLENSO, *St. Paul's Ep. to the Romans*, &c., Lond., 1861; Amer. ed., New York, 1863.

Prof. J. H. SCHOLTEN of Leyden, in his *Dogmatices Christ. Initia*, ed. 2da, Lugd. Bat. 1858, p. 193 f., adopts our construction.   So Athanase COQUEREL, *Christologie* (Paris, 1858), i. 76, note.   So the celebrated Dutch commentator, VAN HENGEL, who in tom. ii. of his *Interpretatio* (1859), pp. 343–360, discusses the passage very fully. He mentions some Dutch scholars that agree with him, as VISSERING and SCHEFFER (*Godgel. Bijdragen* 1853 and 1854), whose writings I have not seen.   The eminent Danish commentator, Dr. H. N. CLAUSEN, *Pauli Brev til Romerne fortolket* (Copenhagen, 1863), p. 124, translates: "Han som er over Alt, Gud, (eller, "Gud, som er over Alt") være priset i Evighed!"   (He is the author of the *Hermeneutik*—the Germans spell his name Klausen.)   HOLTZMANN in his translation of the Epistle in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk* (1864), vol. iv., gives the same construction to the passage; and so Prof. Willibald BEYSCHLAG of Halle, in his *Christologie des N. T.*, Berl. 1866, p. 209 f.

Prof. R. A. LIPSIUS of Jena, in the *Protestanten-Bibel Neuen Testamentes* (1872–73), p. 572, translates:—"Der da ist über Alles, Gott, sei gelobt in Ewigkeit"; VOLKMAR, *Römerbrief* (Zürich, 1875), p. 32:—"Der über Allen seiende Gott sei gelobt in Ewigkeit!"   His comment is (p. 97):—"Der Gott, der über *allen* (Völkern) waltet, sei dafür gepriesen, dass er aus Israel den Heiland (für Alle) hervorgehen liess."   The Rev. John H. GODWIN, "Hon. Prof. New Coll., Lond.," and Congregational Lecturer, translates, "God who is over all be praised for ever. Amen.," and has a good note. (*Ep. to Rom.*, Lond. 1873.)   Prof. Lewis CAMPBELL, the editor of Sophocles, in the *Contemp. Rev.* for Aug., 1876, p. 484, adopts the rendering of Prof. Jowett.   The Rev. Joseph Agar BEET, Wesleyan Methodist, in a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans of very marked ability (Lond. 1877, 2d ed., 1881), defends this view in an excellent note (pp. 267–272, 2d ed.).   The same construction is followed in Herm. BARTELS's *Exeget. Uebersetzung des Briefs*, etc. (Dessau, 1878), which

I mention because Prof. WOLDEMAR SCHMIDT of Leipzig in a notice of the book (*Theol Literaturzeitung*, 1879, No. 22), expresses his approval of this. C. HOLSTEN, in an article in the *Jahrbücher f. prot. Theol.*, 1879, p. 683, translates:—" Der über allen Völkern waltende Gott (der doch Israels Volk so begnadet hat) sei gepriesen in Ewigkeit!"

Some of the best recent *translations* adopt this construction of the passage; e. g. *Het Nieuwe Testament*, etc. (published by the authority of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church), Amst., 1868:—"Hij, die over alles is, God, zij geprezen tot in eeuwigheid!" and the versions by Dr. George R. NOYES (Boston, 1869), Hugues OLTRAMARE (Genéve, 1872), "Que celui qui gouverne toutes choses, Dieu, en soit béni éternellement!" Carl WEIZSÄCKER, *Das N. T. uebersetzt*, Tübingen, 1875, and Dr. Samuel DAVIDSON, Lond., 1875, 2d ed. 1876.

No one who knew the scholarship and the impartiality of the late Dr. Noyes will wonder that I have cited him here. A dispassionate, judicial spirit in the examination of such questions as the one before us is not the exclusive posession of the Dean of Chichester and of "the Church" in distinction from "the Sects," though there are many noble examples of it in the Church of England.

Among critical *editors* of the Greek Testament who have placed a period after σάρκα, making the passage a doxology to God, I may mention HARWOOD (1776), LACHMANN, (1831–50), SCHOTT (4th ed., 1839), TISCHENDORF (1841–73), VON MURALT (1846–48), BUTTMANN (1856–67), Aug. HAHN, assisted by his son G. L. Hahn (1861), KUENEN and COBET (1861), and Westcott and Hort (1881) in their margin, representing the judgment of Dr. HORT.

To these authorities may be added the names of the grammarians WINER and WILKE. See Winer, *Gram.* 7te Aufl., 1867, §§ 61, 3, e., and 64, 2, b., pp. 513, 545, or 551, 586 Thayer, 690, 733 Moulton; and WILKE, *Hermeneutik* (1844), ii. 88.

It is interesting to notice that many scholars who had already in their publications adopted or even strongly contended for the common construction of this passage, afterwards saw reason to change their minds. Such was the case with Eckermann, De Wette, Meyer, Rückert, Bretschneider, Schott, Krehl, Hahn (perhaps both father and son); and it is so with Ritschl, as I am assured by a very intelligent student (the Rev. Alfred Gooding), who took full notes of his exegetical lectures on Romans in the semester of 1879–80. I know of only one instance of a conversion in the opposite direction, that of Dr. G. V. Lechler, who, in the first edition of his *Das apost. u. das*

nachapost. Zeitalter (1851). pp. 38, 39, made the last part of the
verse a doxology to God, but in the second edition (1857), p. 63 f.,
applies it to Christ. He expressly admits, however, as regards the
two opposing views, that "sprachlich und logisch sind beide gleich-
berechtigt."

"THE awful blindness and obstinacy of Arians and Socinians in
their perversions of this passage," says the Scotch commentator
Haldane, "more fully manifest the depravity of human nature, and
the rooted enmity of the carnal mind against God, than the grossest
works of the flesh."*   "The dishonest shifts," says Dean Burgon,
"by which unbelievers seek to evacuate the record which they are
powerless to refute or deny, are paraded by our Revisionists in the
following terms." †   (Here Mr. Burgon quotes the margin of the
Revised version at Rom. ix. 5, regarding these renderings as "not
entitled to notice in the margin of the N. T.," and their admission
as "a very grave offence.")

Σὺ τίς εἶ, ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην, ὁ κατήγωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν ;

In contrast with these utterances, not addressed to the reason of
men, and not adapted to promote Christian charity or Christian
humility, it is refreshing to read a discussion so calm, so clear, so fair,
and so able as that of Professor Dwight.

---

*Exposition of the Ep. to the Romans, Amer. reprint of the 5th Edin-
burgh edition, p. 454.

† *The Quarterly Review* for January, 1882, p. 54; see also the same
for April, 1882, p. 370.

NOTE A.—(See p. 99.)

On the Punctuation of Rom. ix. 5 in Ancient Manuscripts.

In regard to the punctuation of this passage in ancient manuscripts,
though the matter is in itself of little importance, it may be well to cor-
rect some current errors, especially as the supposed absence of a point
after σάρκα in the manuscripts has been urged as an objection to the
construction which makes the ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ. a doxology to God.   For
example, Dr. Gifford, the latest commentator, speaks of the stop after
σάρκα as found simply "in two or three inferior MSS."; while Mr.
Burgon, in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1882, says "*the oldest
codices, besides the whole body of the cursives* [the Italics are his],

know nothing about the method of 'some modern Interpreters' [refer-ring to the margin of the Revised Version]; and he remarks in a note, "C alone has a point between ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων and θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. But this is an entirely different thing from what is noted in the margin." (p. 54.)

The facts of the case do not accord with these statements. In the first place, C, according to Tischendorf's very careful edition of this MS. (Lips. 1843), has no point after πάντων, and there can be little doubt that such a stop exists only in Mr. Burgon's very lively imagination; it *does* have, on the other hand, as Tischendorf's edition shows, both a point and a space after σάρκα, unquestionably *a prima manu*. The Alexandrian manuscript (A) has also a point after σάρκα, as appears by Woide's edition (1786), by the recent photograph published by the British Museum (1879), and by the express testimony of Dr. Vance Smith and of Dr. Sanday, who says, "The point is clearly marked, and it is evidently by the first hand." (*The Expositor*, Sept., 1879; x. 235.) This fact has been overlooked both by Tischendorf, and by Westcott and Hort. There is, moreover, a point after σάρκα in the Vatican man-uscript (B), which, though it does not appear in the Roman edition, is amply attested by Dr. Vance Smith from personal inspection (*The Expositor*, May, 1879, ix. 399, comp. his *The Spirit and the Word of Christ*, Lond., 1874, p. 138), and by others. This point also, from the description of it, seems to be probably by the first hand, though more careful examination and comparison may be required to settle the ques-tion.* The Clermont MS. (D) ends a stichometric line at σάρκα, but

---

* The facts as to the Vatican MS. are these. Tischendorf, who has given the most careful attention to its palæography, states that "ipsam primam manum passim, in nonnullis libris haud raro interpunxisse, sine ulla dubitatione asseverandum est." (*N. T. Vat.* p. xx.; comp. p. xxi.) The later hand, of the tenth or eleventh century, has but rarely supplied points. (*Ibid.*) The original scribe indicates a pause, sometimes by a small space simply; sometimes by such a space with a point, and some-times by a point with a *very* small space between the letters or none at all. Of the latter there are two unquestionable examples by the first hand in Tischendorf's facsimiles, made from parts of the MS. which, having been accidentally repeated, were wholly untouched by the cor-rector and freshener of the ink, namely, after the word οφειλημα in Rom. iv. 4 (cod. p. 1448), where there is no space, and after κειται in 2 Cor. iii. 15 (cod. p. 1479), where the space is exceedingly small. Tisch-endorf was unable to examine carefully the punctuation of the MS. beyond the end of the Gospel of Luke; but he observed that punctua-tion was much more frequent in the Epistles than in the Gospels. I notice that in the Roman edition there are 12 points on the page (p. 1453) that contains Rom. ix. 5, extending from Rom. viii. 23 (εχον)τες to μηπω γαρ ix. 11, inclusive. There is no extra space after σάρκα, but perhaps that does not diminish the probability that the point is by the first hand. There is no extra space, as we have seen, after οφειλημα in Rom. iv. 4; and Tischendorf observes (*Nov. Test. Sin.* p. xix.) that there

this does not determine the construction of what follows. The Sinaitic MS. has only a single point (after ουτως Rom. ix. 20) in the whole page containing the passage, 4 cols. of 48 lines each, from Rom. viii. 38 ουτε ενεστωτα to αγνοουντες x. 3, inclusive. It is therefore neutral. The same is true for a different reason of F and G, in which the numerous points are distributed in the most arbitrary manner, so that, although they each have a point after σάρκα, it counts for nothing. We have no report of K, collated by Matthaei, who does not record the punctuation of MSS. L, the remaining uncial, has a point after σάρκα according to Tischendorf. There is no break between ο ων and αμην in A B C.

As to the cursive MSS., their punctuation has been very rarely noted by collators. The sweeping statement of Mr. Burgon is made entirely at random. But a point after σάρκα is found in at least six cursives, viz. No. 5 (collated by Scholz), 47 (by Griesbach), 71, 77, 80, and 89 (by Birch); also in the beautiful Greek Praxapostolos or Lectionary of the twelfth century belonging to the Library of Harvard College (pp. 150, 151), and the fine Lectionary in the Astor Library (p. 117), assigned to the eleventh century (?), formerly in the possession of the Duke of Sussex. In the Harvard Lectionary there is also a point after θεός, which is not the case in the Astor Library manuscript.* A point has also been noted after θεός in 17 (Griesb.), and after πάντων in 71 (Birch).

Incorrect statements are often made in regard to the extreme rarity of punctuation in our oldest N. T. MSS. I therefore note the fact, that on the page of the Alexandrian MS. (A) which contains our passage, extending from Rom. viii. 21 αλλα δια των υποταξαντα to προθεσις του θυ μεν . . ix. 11, there are 64 points in Woide's edition; in the Ephrem MS. (C) from Rom. viii. 27 ο δε ερευνων to αμην ix. 5 in Tischendorf's edition there are 45 points; for B see above. In the three pages of Paul's Epistles in B published by Tischendorf line for line in his

___

are points with no space in the Sinaitic MS. after the words πονηρια · κακια · πλεονεξια · Rom. i. 29. On the page of B (1453) which contains Rom. ix. 5 there is no extra space in the printed edition with the point after απεκδεχομεθα, col. 1, l. 12, or after τεκνα, col. 3, l. 28. It will be observed that all the words which have been mentioned end with the letter A, which on account of its peculiar form in the uncial MSS. did not need any extra space for the insertion of a point after it at the top of the line, the shape of the letter necessarily leaving a space there. But the absence of extra space after the letter would render it less likely that the late corrector would insert a point after it.

It is expressly stated by a gentleman who recently examined the MS., and whose letter from Rome I have been permitted to see, that the point after σάρκα " is of lighter color than the adjoining letters," and that it was certainly much fainter than a point in the space after ημων on the same page, " which was as black as the touched letters."

*For a careful copy of that part of the Astor Library manuscript which contains Rom. ix. 4, 5, I am indebted to the kindness of the Rev. S. M. Jackson.

Appendix codd. celeb. Sin. Vat. Alex. (1867), p. 1445 (Rom. i. 1–26) has 15 points which he regards as *a prima manu;* p. 1460 (Rom. xv. 24— xvi. 17) has 35; p. 1506 (Col. iv. 8—1 Thess. i. 8, with more than half à column blank, has 17.   These pages, however, were selected partly on account of their exceptional frequency of punctuation.

The truth is, that this whole matter of punctuation in the ancient MSS. is of exceedingly small importance, which might be shown more fully, had not this paper already extended to an excessive length.   In the first place, we cannot infer with confidence the construction given to the passage by the punctuator, the distribution of points even in the oldest MSS. is so abnormal; in the second place, if we could, to how much would his authority amount?

All that I have argued from the point after σάρκα in A B C L, &c., is that a pause after that word was felt by ancient scribes to be natural.

NOTE B.   (See p. 112.)

On the Distinction between εὐλογητός and εὐλογημένος.

The distinction between εὐλογητός and εὐλογημένος is dwelt upon by Philo, *De Migr. Abrah.* c. 19, Opp. i. 453, in his remarks on Gen. xii. 2.   The former word, according to him, describes one who by nature or character is *worthy* of praise or blessing, εὐλογίας ἄξιος; the latter one who is in fact praised or blessed, whether rightfully or otherwise.   In other words, εὐλογητός, in doxologies, would be *laudandus* or *laude dignus;* εὐλογημένος *laudatus.*   So Theodore of Mopsuestia on Eph. i. 3 explains εὐλογητός as τοῦ ἐπαινεῖσθαι καὶ θαυμάζεσθαι ἄξιος.   (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* lxvi. 912.)   It is true that in classical Greek verbals in -τός, like the Latin participles in -*tus*, have generally a simply passive signification; but we find exceptions, particularly in the later Greek, and especially in the case of words analogous in meaning to εὐλογητός. See in the Lexicons αἰνετός, ἐπαινετός, ὑπεραινετός, ἐγκωμιαστός, θαυμαστός, μακαριστός (2 Macc. vii. 24), μεμπτός, ψεκτός, μισητός, στυγητός, ὑμνητός, ὑπερυμνητός.   On ἐπαινετός and ψεκτός see Philo, *ubi supra*.   (See also Kühner, *Ausführl. Gram.,* 2te Aufl., i. 716.) This view is confirmed by the fact that we never find εὐλογητός used like εὐλογημένος with εἴη or ἔστω; wherever the verb is expressed with εὐλογητός it is always in the indicative.   For example, in Rom. i. 25, τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, it is surely more natural to take εὐλογητός as signifying "to be praised," *laudandus*, than actually "praised," *laudatus*.   See Fritzsche and Van Hengel *in loc.,* the latter of whom cites the passage of Philo referred to above.   So in other

doxologies we find the indicative, εὐλογητός εἶ, Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 12;
Judith xiii. 17; Tob. iii. 11; viii. 5, 15, 16, 17; xi. 13; Orat. Azar. 2; Cant.
trium puer. (Fritzsche), 28, 30, 31, 32, 33; 1 Esdr. iv. 60; 1 Macc. iv. 20;
Const. Apost. vii. 34, 49; Act. Phil. c. 26; Lit. S. Jac. in Hammond's
Antient Liturgies (Oxford, 1878), pp. 25, 26, 28, 31, 33, 38, 39, 53, 54;
Lit. Const. (Anaph. S. Chrys.), p. 119; (Anaph. S. Basil.) p. 128; Lit. S.
Marci, p. 179; and so ὁ ὢν εὐλογητός, 2 Cor. xi. 31; Lit. S. Marci, pp.
176, 192. This is the view of many excellent scholars besides Fritzsche
and Van Hengel; as Erasmus, Beza (on Mark xiv. 61), Crell on Rom.
ix. 5, Tholuck, Rückert, and the lexicographers Schleusner, Wahl, Bret-
schneider, and Robinson. On the other side there are indeed very emi-
nent names, as Grimm in his *Lex.*, Meyer, De Wette and Philippi on
Rom. i. 25, and Harless on Eph. i. 3, but I find no argument in any of
them except Harless, and his arguments seem to me of little weight.
They rest mainly on the assumption that εὐλογητός is taken to mean
" one who *must* be praised" instead " one to whom praise is *due*." That
the latter conception of God may naturally be expressed in a doxology
is shown by Rev. iv. 11, ἄξιος εἶ, ὁ κύριος καὶ θεὸς ἡμῶν, λαβεῖν τὴν
δόξαν, κ. τ. λ.; comp. Rev. v. 12. See also Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum*,
ed. Galura, ii. 186 (S. Bonifatius, § 12), ὅτι σοι πρέπει τιμὴ κ. τ. λ., and
iii. 62 (SS. Tarachus, Probus, *etc.* § 11), ὅτι αὐτῷ πρέπει δόξα κ. τ. λ.;
Const. Ap. vii. 48; Act. Barn. c. 26; Act. Joh. c. 22; Protev. Jac. c. 25,
§ 2, MSS.; Act. Pil. A. c. 16, § 8, MSS.; Narr. Jos. c. 5, § 4. I accord-
ingly agree with Buttmann, *N. T. Gram.* p. 120, (137 Thayer), that in dox-
ologies with εὐλογητός we are to supply ἐστίν rather than εἴη or ἔστω.
The sentence is therefore, in these cases, grammatically considered,
declarative, not optative, though the whole *effect* of the original is per-
haps better given by rendering " be blessed" than " is to be praised."
Compare further 1 Pet. iv. 11; Matt. vi. 13 (text. rec.); Clem. Rom. *Ep.
ad Cor.* c. 58 (new addit.; *contra*, c. 32); and see Lightfoot's note on
Gal. i. 5.

We must notice the difference in meaning, not affecting however the
position of the words, between εὐλογητός in the Septuagint when applied
to men, as in Gen. (xii. 2, variante lectione) xxiv. 31 (v. l.); xxvi. 29 (v. l.);
Deut. vii. 14; (xxviii. 6, v. l.; xxxiii. 24, v. l.); Judg. xvii. 2 (v. l.); 1 Sam.
xv. 13 (v. l.); Judith xiii. 18 (v. l.); Tob. xi. 16 (in one text), and when
applied to God. In the former case it is used in the sense of " pros-
pered," " blessed " (viz. by God), and is to be taken, probably, in a simply
passive sense; εὐλογημένος often occurs as a various reading. As ap-
plied to God, I believe Philo's distinction holds good. In the particular
case, however, to which he refers, Gen. xii. 2, where he reads εὐλογητός
(so many other authorities, see Holmes), applied to Abraham, his expo-
sition is fanciful. In several cases the terms may seem to be intention-
ally distinguished; see Gen. xiv. 19, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33; Tob. xi. 16
Sin.; *contra*, Judith xiii. 18.

One other remark may be made. In speaking of εὐλογητός and similar words in "exclamatory doxologies" (see above, pp. 31–39), we must guard against a fallacy. "Exclamatory" as applied to sentences denotes a characteristic which exists in very different degrees in different cases; where one printer would use a mark of exclamation, another would often put a period. Because the placing of such a predicate as εὐλογητός first in the sentence gives or tends to give it an exclamatory character, we cannot straightway draw the inference that in *all* doxologies in which the verb is omitted εὐλογητός, if used, must have the first place. One may admit that in exclamatory doxologies εὐλογητός always stands first, and deny that the doxology in Rom. ix. 5 is exclamatory. The elliptical word I suppose to be ἐστί, as in most at least of the clauses immediately preceding.

CORRECTION.

The statement on p. 108 about the reading of the ancient versions in Gen. xxvi. 29 lacks precision. The versions made directly from the Hebrew, of course, do not come under consideration. Of those made from the Septuagint, the Armenian, the Georgian, and the Old Slavic (Cod. Ostrog.) support σὺ εὐλογ.; the Ethiopic, εὐλογ. σύ; the Old Latin has perished; and the Coptic, as I am informed by Prof. T. O. Paine, omits the last clause of the verse.

Examination of Exodus xxxiii. 7-11.

BY PROF. C. M. MEAD, PH. D.

This passage has occasioned much perplexity and discussion. The difficulty is a very obvious one, when the passage is considered in connection with the context. In chh. xxiv.–xxxi. we have the account of Moses' being called up into the mount, and there receiving directions concerning the building of the tabernacle. In ch. xxxii. is narrated how the people, during Moses' long delay, had made them a golden calf, and how Moses, after administering reproof and chastisement, returned to Jehovah to intercede for the people. In ch. xxxiii. 1–3, Jehovah renews his promise that the people shall go to the land of Canaan, and says, "I will send an angel before thee and I will drive out the Canaanite," etc. . . . "for I will not go up in the midst of thee: for thou art a stiffnecked people; lest I consume thee in the way." In consequence of this utterance, it is said (ver. 4) that "the people mourned, and no man did put on him his ornaments." Then, in ver. 5, we have an apparent repetition of ver. 3, "And Jehovah said unto Moses, Say unto the children of Israel, Ye are a stiffnecked people; should I for one moment go up in the midst of thee, I should consume thee: and now put off thy ornaments from thee, that I may know what I will do with thee." This command to put off the ornaments, coming after the statement that the people did not put them on, seems to be out of place. The A. V. accordingly renders, "For the Lord *had said* unto Moses," etc. We are not warranted in so translating, though often the Vav Consecutive introduces a verb which is not consecutive to the foregoing in a strictly chronological sense. But inasmuch as ver. 5 is a repetition and enlargement of ver. 3, and is followed (ver. 6) by the statement, "And the children of Israel stripped themselves of their ornaments from Mt. Horeb on," we are compelled to hold that vers. 5 and 6 are a substantial repetition of the foregoing, with the addition that the laying off of the ornaments was in direct consequence of a divine

command, even though we assume, with some, that we have here two distinct narratives loosely put together.   But, at the worst, no serious difficulty need be found here.   It is when we come to the following five verses that the real puzzle is presented.   After this statement about Jehovah's threat and the people's humiliation, as indicated by their not wearing their ornaments from this time on, we read (according to the usual rendering), "And Moses took the tent, and pitched it without the camp, and called it the Tent of Meeting.   And it came to pass, when Moses went out unto the tent, that all the people rose up and stood, every man at his tent door, and looked after Moses until he was gone into the tent.   And it came to pass, as Moses entered into the tent, the pillar of cloud descended, and stood at the door of the tent; and all the people rose up and worshipped, every man at his tent door.   And Jehovah spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend.   And he turned again into the camp: but his servant, Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tent."

The difficulties presented by this passage are two: (1) It speaks of the Tent of Meeting (A. V., "tabernacle of the congregation") as of a structure already erected, whereas, according to the rest of the book, it was as yet only projected, but not built; (2) the passage interrupts the narrative of ch. xxxiii. itself; for ver. 12 seqq. is a direct continuation of the communication between Jehovah and Moses; and vers. 7–11 have (as usually understood) no visible connection with it.

The first of these difficulties those who hold to the unity of authorship, or at least consistency of authorship, have attempted to solve in two ways: (a) Some have thought that the tent here spoken of was Moses' own tent, which he now set apart provisionally for sacred purposes until the permanent structure should be completed.   But it is hard to see why, if Moses' private tent was intended, it should not have been called "*his* tent" instead of "*the* tent."   Moreover, the following verses represent Moses as being only occasionally in this tent, *i. e.* only for the purpose of special communication with Jehovah.   Where was he to eat and sleep?   What was to be his ordinary dwelling-place?   This difficulty is evaded, not met, when Keil translates "*a* tent," and says that it was a tent of Moses which, on account of the divine revelations made in it, became a provisional tabernacle.   If the meaning is that it was one of Moses' tents, then, to say nothing of the fact that it is a pure assumption to suppose that he had several tents of his own, the use of the definite article is unaccountable.   If he had but one tent, the definite article would be less objectionable,

though even then very strange; but if he had several, and this was only one, such a construction is quite inadmissible.

(*b*) The other explanation is that the tent here mentioned was a sanctuary which from the first had been used as a central place of worship, and is therefore familiarly called "the tent." The obvious objection to this is, that there is no previous reference to any such structure, and it seems singular that in the first place where it is mentioned it should be called simply "the tent." Moreover, the paragraph before us produces the impression that this was the beginning of the religious use made of this tent. It was now taken and pitched outside of the camp, and called the tent of meeting. It may, indeed, be urged that it is intrinsically probable that there had been some sanctuary from the first; but this narrative can be made to refer to such a sanctuary only by a very strained exegesis.

But these interpretations, while they, if otherwise admissible, remove the first difficulty—the absurdity of telling what was done with a building not yet erected—do not at all relieve the second one, the interruption of the account of Moses' conversation with Jehovah. When Moses says (ver. 12), "See, thou sayest unto me, Bring up this people; and thou hast not let me know whom thou wilt send with me," there is a manifest and direct reference to Jehovah's promise (ver. 2) that "an angel" should go before them. Moses is grieved because Jehovah himself refuses to go with them, and only sends an unknown angel; and he intercedes for a modification of the divine sentence. Now, in the midst of this negotiation is inserted the account of what Moses did with this unknown tent. No one can reasonably suppose that it describes what happened at this time; it is commonly understood to describe a customary use made of the tent; but there is obviously not only no reason for interjecting the account here, but the best of all reasons why it should not have been interjected, viz., that it has nothing to do with the things related in the context, and inexcusably interrupts the narrative. And these conjectures about what this tent was—conjectures at the best without any positive support, and such as would never have been thought of except for the anachronism respecting the real tabernacle—do not at all relieve us as regards the incongruity between this passage and the rest of the chapter. On any theory of the authorship of the Exodus, here is a very serious difficulty. Such a causeless breach of continuity is quite without parallel; and the least that can be said of the paragraph in question (as commonly understood) is that it is misplaced. And this brings us to a third theory respecting the difficulty in question.

(*c*) It is held that these five verses refer to the same tabernacle as

the one elsewhere more largely described, but that they are by a different author, and are here inserted out of place. In confirmation of this view, we are pointed to discrepancies between this account of the tabernacle and the more detailed one, besides the one already noticed. Thus it is observed that, according to the passage before us, the only use made of the tabernacle was its occasional occupation by Moses in order to receive divine communications, whereas elsewhere little or nothing is said about Moses' being in it, the chief use of it being sacerdotal. Again, according to the section before us, Joshua was to remain permanently in the tent; whereas, according to the other accounts (Num. i. 51, iii. 10, 38, xviii. 7, 22), only Aaron and his descendants were allowed to enter it. Furthermore, the tabernacle is here said to be outside of the camp, whereas later (Num. ii. 17) the tabernacle is located in the midst of the camp. These discrepancies are thought to betray the hand of a different writer in the passage before us from that of the author of the other accounts.

This hypothesis, however, not only does nothing to relieve the first difficulty, the anachronism respecting the tabernacle, but leaves the second of the difficulties entirely untouched. The differences in the conception of the tabernacle might indeed be thus explained; but it is still left unexplained how the compiler of the book should ever have been led to insert this narrative in this place. That he might sometimes disregard or overlook discrepancies of a minor sort, in putting together writings of different authors, rather than dissect and distort the writings, is very conceivable. But there is everywhere manifest such a disposition to construct an orderly and on the whole self-consistent history, that so glaring an anachronism and contradiction as is here presented is without parallel and without excuse. He could not have been ignorant of the fact that the tabernacle which he now describes as in existence had, according to the other documents, not yet been built. Moreover, he must have seen that the present place is in every way a most inappropriate one for introducing it, inasmuch as it interrupts in an utterly impertinent and irrelevant manner the account of Moses' communication with Jehovah. When we consider how freely, on the ordinary theory of compilation, the writings of the various original authors were chopped up and patched together, sometimes so that one-half of a verse is assigned to one author and all of the context to another, there would seem to be no conceivable reason why the redactor should not here, when the occasion was so urgent, have either omitted this paragraph, or else have reserved it for a later time when it would have been in place.

It is therefore no material relief to assume that this whole section

(xxxii.-xxxiv.) about the golden calf and Moses' intercession being
Jehovistic, the redactor finding it in this shape did not care to detach
any part of it from the rest, notwithstanding the glaring discrepancy
which was thus introduced into the history. But even if this did
afford some relief, there would remain unexplained why the Jehovist
himself should have put together his own material in such a way as
this; for, as we have seen, irrespective of the anachronism between
xxxiii. 7-11 and the longer account of the tabernacle, this section is
out of place even as related to its immediate context. Dillmann, feel-
ing this difficulty, attributes these verses (xxxiii. 7-11) not to the
Jehovist, but to the younger Elohist, to whom he also attributes
mainly the first six verses also. But this is only shifting the trouble,
not removing it; it rather increases it. For if the redactor had two
or three narratives to make his compilation from; if Ex. xxxiii. 7-11
was not a constituent and original part of the whole section xxxii-
xxxiv; then the wonder is all the greater why the redactor should
have put together the narratives of different authors so as to create
such palpable confusion and contradiction, when it would have been
just as easy, and every way more sensible, to insert this short para-
graph, if at all, in a place where it chronologically belongs. If it is
supposed that the redactor himself is not responsible for this arrange-
ment, but found these five verses from the younger Elohist already
incorporated with the Jehovist's account of the golden calf, etc., then
this only raises the question, How did such incorporation *ever*
take place? *Some one* must have put together the two things in this
absurd way; and go back as far as we may in our conjectures, the
difficulty remains the same, and remains unsolved. There is every
presumption against such a historical account of the use of the taber-
nacle having been interpolated into this narrative of the negotiation
between Jehovah and Moses.

Delitzsch, in the second of his recent articles on the Pentateuch,
which treats of the tabernacle, ranks himself among those who assume
that the tabernacle of this passage is the same as the one previously
described, and that this passage is from a different author from that of
the other and more detailed account of the tabernacle. He thinks
that the one wrote without any purpose of supplementing the other,
and that the two accounts were put together by a redactor who must
have had some desire to harmonize them. "Probably," says he,
"he was led by this desire to give this abruptly-beginning section its
present position, so that the putting of the sacred tent out of the camp,
and far away from it, appears as a penal consequence of the people's
sin of apostasy." This suggestion is an approach towards what I

regard as the true solution.   But it does not remove the difficulties already set forth.   If the redactor was influenced by a harmonistic intent here, he had very poor success in the execution of it, since, by representing Moses as removing the tabernacle at this juncture, he brings this account into the flattest contradiction with the other accounts of the tabernacle, according to which the sanctuary was not yet erected.   That the removal of the tabernacle from the midst of the camp, might have served as a punishment of the people's apostasy, is very true, provided there was a tabernacle in existence; but, inasmuch as according to the rest of the book, there was none as yet, and the redactor himself has given us to understand the fact, it seems almost like satire to speak of him as attempting to harmonize the different accounts by representing the people as punished by the removal of a non-existent tabernacle.   Besides all this, there remains untouched the other difficulty, that the section in question is utterly incongruous with the immediate context.

One other explanation may be mentioned, that of those who hold (*d*) that the detailed account of the tabernacle is a fiction, and that the tent in the narrative before us is a real tent, in which the ark was kept.   This is the view *e. g.* of Graf, who holds moreover that the Elohistic account of the tabernacle is later than the one before us. He explains the position of the longer narratives of the tabernacle with reference to Ex. xxxiii. 7–11 as follows : " It was occasioned by the mention of the אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד in xxxiii. 7 sqq.; but the direction to

build had been given to Moses on the mount, and therefore belonged to the place where his forty days' stay on the mount was told of, xxiv. 18; the execution of the command, however, had to be preceded by that which was immediately connected with his descent from the mount, xxxii.–xxxiv.; therefore the description of the structure was inserted immediately before the laws which were to be given before setting out from Sinai, with which laws this description was closely connected (*Geschichtliche Bücher des A. T.* p. 60)."   But this solution is as inadequate as the others to meet the real difficulties.   The whole value of it depends upon the shrewdness of the critic's guess as to the reason why these narratives are arranged as they are; but even if we assume the guess to be a shrewd one, the relief is the slightest possible.   By assuming the Elohistic account to be a pure fiction we do indeed in one sense explain how the two accounts are inconsistent with one another; but inasmuch as the redactor is supposed to have had an intelligent motive in his work, the problem is not solved till we can discover both intelligence and motive.   Graf has assigned a

motive, but it is at the expense of the redactor's intelligence. The redactor is supposed to have inserted the Elohistic directions concerning the tabernacle before this Jehovistic section (xxxii.–xxxiv.) for the reason that in the latter the Tent of Meeting is mentioned, and it is mentioned in the account of what happened immediately after Moses' descent from the mount, where the directions were given. Therefore, it is further assumed that the actual erection of the tabernacle is put after this Jehovistic narrative for the reason that immediately after Moses' descent there had been no time for the work of building. In other words, because in this Jehovistic section the tabernacle is spoken of as an existent fact, therefore the redactor puts the Elohistic account of the command to build it before this mention, but puts the Elohistic account of the actual building of it after the Jehovistic account which speaks of it as already built! This, then, is the solution of the first difficuty—a solution which is attained by assuming the fictitiousness of one of the narratives, the inconsistency of the fictitious narrative with the older historical one, the agency of a redactor in putting the two together as one whole, and the egregious stupidity of the redactor in that he, in doing his best to weave the narratives together, gives us to understand that the tabernacle was not built until after it had been used! As to the second difficulty, this explanation, like all the others, simply leaves it untouched.

But perhaps enough has been said in setting forth the difficulties under which the ordinary theories labor. Yet it is important to present these clearly, in order the better to justify a new attempt. Especially would I insist on the second of the two difficulties as one challenging more attention than it has yet received. As already observed, ver. 12 is immediately connected with vers. 1–6. It is manifestly a continuation of the narrative respecting Jehovah's communication with Moses. That these five verses (7–11) cannot (as Keil seems to hold) describe what happened in the course of this communication is so obvious that it hardly needs demonstration. The simple fact that these verses (if historical at all) manifestly narrate something that was customary, is the conclusive refutation of any such notion. This being so, the only refuge, on the ordinary theories, is to assume that these verses are misplaced. But how or why these verses should ever have become placed here, is more than any one has ever discovered. No parallel to such a misplacement can anywhere be found, unless perhaps the account of the adulteress in John viii. is such an instance. But that passage, whatever may be true respecting its authenticity, is without the support of good manuscript authority in this place, whereas the oldest versions and MSS. fail to

cast any suspicion on the passage in Exodus. The presumption is that the passage is in the right place. Not until it is proved impossible to justify its present position, should we resort to the hypothesis that it belongs elsewhere.

Let us now see if there is not a solution which meets both of these difficulties, and not merely one; and a solution which does not, like the most of those considered, increase the embarrassment more than it relieves it. Such a solution, as I conceive, is suggested by the remarkable fact that the verbs in this section are *Future verbs throughout*, or, what is the same thing, Perfects with the Vav Consecutive. This fact, not at all noticed by most commentators, is casually alluded to by some as an instance of the Future used to denote a customary past action. The idea that the verbs may be actual Futures seems not to have occurred to any of them. And yet the presumption is greatly in favor of so translating them. The Imperfect, in historical narration, is always to be rendered by the Future, unless there is evidence to the contrary. In the present case what is the evidence to the contrary? Whatever that evidence may be, is it strong enough to compel us to translate the passage in such a way as to involve us in the serious perplexities which have been shown to beset the ordinary translation? Are not these grave enough to warrant us in translating the passage in the simplest and grammatically most natural way, unless we are thus landed in still greater difficulties? Certain it is that by rendering these verbs as Futures we remove at one stroke the two difficulties which have been considered. By so understanding them we simply make these verses, not a statement of what was done with an existing tabernacle, but a divine direction concerning what should be done with the future tabernacle. They are made, in short, to be the continuation of the language of Jehovah contained in ver. 5. Let us now substantiate this view more particularly.

A word first as to the grammatical question. It is of course not to be denied that the Imperfect is often used with reference to past actions. But in prose such instances are rare, and are, so far as I know, nowhere else kept up through so long a section as this; and where they are so used, the reference to repeated or habitual actions is clear. In the present case, it is true, many of the verbs might be understood as describing a customary action; but not all, and notably not the first three, can easily be so understood. It would be unnatural to translate, "And Moses used to take the tent, and used to pitch it without the camp, and used to call it the tent of meeting.". These verbs apparently denote single actions; and what reason could

the writer have had for using the Future tense? It is reasonable to insist strongly on this fact, and to claim that the original presumption in favor of the Future rendering is redoubled in force by the absence of any assignable reason for using the Future tense at the opening of this section, unless the writer meant the verbs to describe something really future.

In addition to the grammatical consideration, now, we find that this construction relieves us of the whole difficulty arising from the apparent anachronism. The passage now does not imply that the tabernacle is already constructed, but it is only a direction what to do with it when it shall be constructed. We are under no necessity, therefore, of inventing a sanctuary, antecedent to the real tabernacle, and yet bearing the same name; or of supposing that Moses had to be turned out of house and home, in order to provide a place for religious worship. The Tent of Meeting is the same here as in the preceding chapters—in both cases something that is yet to be. We are also under no necessity of accounting for contradictions by assuming plurality and inconsistency in the authorship of the different narratives. If it be said that there are other marks of diverse authorship besides the anachronism and the apparent misplacement, it is enough to reply that the interpretation which I propose leaves room for as many authors as any one chooses to assume; only it does not require us to find so much contradiction between the different authors as has been heretofore found. If it is held that, in maintaining the theory of plurality of authorship, it is important to make the disagreements as great as possible, instead of seeking, so far as can be done reasonably, to reconcile them, then that may be regarded as an objection to the proposed interpretation. But I am not aware, though this seems to be the principle practically followed by many critics, that it has yet become an established canon of hermeneutics.

The presumption is that the tent called אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד is the same thing here as in the preceding chapters. On any theory but the one now propounded, these five verses appear to be entirely inexplicable. But regarded as a direction concerning what should be done, they are perfectly appropriate and intelligible where they stand. Moses had been told to say unto the people that Jehovah would not go up in the midst of them. They were commanded to put off their ornaments, that Jehovah might know what he would do unto them. In ver. 6 we are parenthetically told that the command was complied with; and then, in vers. 7–11, we are further told what Jehovah did decide to

do with them. Having declared that he could not go up in the *midst* of the people, he determines to indicate this symbolically by requiring that the Tent of Meeting, which Moses has received orders to have constructed, and which was to serve as the place of Jehovah's manifestation of himself, should be pitched, not in the *midst* of the camp, but far off, *outside* of it. Jehovah was to be distant from the people; they were to be reminded of their sin by the location of the tabernacle. These verses, instead of being an unaccountable interruption of the context, are thus in perfect keeping with it.

Not only are these two most pressing difficulties removed by this interpretation, but also the apparent discrepancies which have been mentioned between this account of the tabernacle and the other accounts of it are relieved, if not entirely done away. Thus, what is said about Joshua's remaining in the tabernacle creates a difficulty at the worst no greater when the verbs are rendered as Futures than when they are rendered as Preterites. In fact, the discrepancy is relieved. As now translated, these verses express a threat simply, and a threat which, as the following verses show, was not fulfilled. Moses' intercession (ver. 12–16) secures from Jehovah the promise (ver. 17), "I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken, for thou hast found grace in my sight." It might be said, then, that everything in this account of the tabernacle which appears to conflict with the other descriptions of its use, may be explained as a part of a threat never carried out, so that the discrepancy falls of itself. Still, as may be reasonably urged, the discrepancy respecting Joshua has been unduly magnified. The passages which forbid any but the priests to come nigh the tabernacle have reference, as Num. xvi. 40 clearly intimates, to those who come for the purpose of exercising sacerdotal functions. Moses, at all events, though not a son of Aaron, could, according to the Elohist, enter the tabernacle and there commune with Jehovah (Ex. xxv. 22, xxix. 42; xxx. 6, 36); and he is associated with Aaron and the priests in the arrangement of the encampment with reference to the tabernacle (Num. iii. 38). Now, Aaron having become himself implicated in the people's sin, it may be regarded as a part of the penalty imposed, that he is not to enter the tabernacle. That Joshua, as Moses' confidential attendant, should be with him in the tabernacle, is no stranger than that he should accompany him to the mount when he was to commune with Jehovah (Ex. xxiv. 13, xxxii. 17).

A similar remark applies to the discrepancy respecting the use made of the tabernacle. In Ex. xxxiii. 7–11 it appears to be only an oracle; nothing is said about priests or sacrifices. If Aaron, as an

accomplice in the sin of the people, was to suffer punishment with them, this would explain the absence of all mention of him.   And the revocation of the threat removes all the discrepancy in any case; for even the Elohistic narrative speaks of the tabernacle as a place where God was to meet with Moses (Ex. xxv. 22) and with the people (xxix. 43).

In like manner, the difference relative to the location of the tabernacle disappears, when it is considered that the command to put it outside of the camp symbolizes Jehovah's refusal to go up in the midst of the people.   If, as is the fact, this refusal was revoked, then that the tabernacle should afterwards be spoken of as in the midst of the camp is just what is to be expected.*

It thus appears that all the difficulties which have beset the passage under consideration are either wholly removed or greatly lessened, while none of them are increased by the proposed translation.   It would seem, then, that an interpretation so simple as this, one favored by grammatical idiom, and one that solves the puzzles that are created by the ordinary translation, ought to be adopted unless there are very weighty objections to it.   What, then, can be said against it?

1. It may be said that ver. 6 being a historical statement, the presumption is that the language of Jehovah ends with ver. 5.—It is sufficient to reply that, though there may be such a presumption, there are yet so many instances of similar parenthetical construction, that the objection is anything but decisive.   Thus, in Ex. iv. 4, 5, we read, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Put forth thy hand, and take it by the tail.   And he put forth his hand, and caught it, and it became a rod in his hand: that they may believe that the Lord God of their fathers . . . . hath appeared unto thee."   A precisely simi-

---

* It may be objected to this that the discrepancy as to the location of the tabernacle is not confined to the passage before us, but recurs in Num. xi. 24–30, in the narrative concerning Eldad and Medad, where it is said of them (ver. 26) that they " remained in the camp" and " went not out unto the tabernacle."   Also in Num. xii. 4 Moses, Aaron, and Miriam are commanded to "come out unto the tabernacle of the congregation."   These passages, it must be admitted, make the impression that the tabernacle was outside of the camp.   But these expressions might be used of those who went out of their tents to the tabernacle, even though the tabernacle was in the centre of the encampment, especially if it was separated by a considerable distance from the surrounding tents.   This is confirmed by the fact that in xi. 24 it is said of Moses that he " went out, and told the people the words of the Lord," where, whether the going out was from the tabernacle, where Moses had been receiving the divine communications, (Keil), or from his own tent (Knobel), it certainly does not mean that he went out of the camp.   In Ex. xxxiii. 7 the word מֵחוּץ is used; this is explicit; nothing of the sort is found in Numbers.

lar construction occurs in Ex. iv. 7, 8. Cf. also Matt. ix. 6, Mark
ii. 10, Luke v. 24. In these cases the interruption of the grammat-
ical construction is perhaps even more disturbing than in the one
before us. It is not at all unnatural that, in immediate connection
with the command concerning the ornaments, it should be parenthet-
ically remarked that the command was obeyed. This objection,
therefore, is, at the most, of little weight.

2. Again, it may be objected that, if these verses are the continua-
tion of Jehovah's address to Moses, then Moses ought to be addressed
in the second person, and Jehovah ought to speak of himself in the
first, whereas both Moses and Jehovah are here spoken of in the third
person. This is doubtless the chief thing which has made this sec-
tion appear to be a historical statement rather than a direction con-
cerning the future. This grammatical fact by itself certainly does
favor the common translation. But every Hebrew scholar knows
how frequent, and often how very abrupt, the changes of person are
in that language. See a parallel construction in Ex. xxiv. 1, 2.
Indeed, in the verses immediately preceding we have an illustration
of this. Jehovah commands Moses to say to the people, "Ye are a
stiffnecked people; should *I* go up in the midst of thee, I should
consume thee." This, taken strictly, would represent Moses as the
consuming one. And, what is more to the point, inasmuch as what
Moses is told to say to the people has the form of a direct address of
God to the people, it is in fact in perfect consistency with this, if not
indeed required by it, that Moses should be spoken of in the third
person. The only really strange thing is, therefore, that Jehovah
should be spoken of in the third person, and not continue to use the
first. But examples of this idiom are extremely numerous. *E. g.*,
xxxiv. 10–26 we find that Jehovah, in a series of commands addressed
to the people, repeatedly speaks of himself as a third person. Thus
(ver. 14), "Thou shalt worship no other god; for Jehovah, whose
name is jealous, is a jealous God." This circumstance, therefore, of
a change of persons is by no means a serious objection to the pro-
posed construction.

3. It may be said that, if ver. 7 is a continuation of ver. 5, the
verb in the Perfect with the Vav Consecutive should precede the sub-
ject, whereas the subject now stands first, with the verb following in
the Imperfect. This objection (which has been privately urged by
some to whom the proposed translation has been presented) I fail to
see the force of. That ordinarily the subject follows the verb is very
true; but here the verb certainly does follow the subject; and this
position of it is no more difficult to explain on one theory than on

another.   That the verb may be Jussive here is shown by the pre-
cisely parallel constructions in Gen. i. 20, 22, where Jussive verbs,
following a Jussive or Imperative, are placed after the subject.   If it
is asked why the subject here precedes the verb, the answer must be
either that the clause is a circumstantial one, or that an emphasis lies
on the subject.   Against the former explanation, it must be objected
that circumstantial clauses should have some obvious relation to the
context, whereas these verses (if historical) have none.   If they
described something which happened at this time, something which
illustrates or explains the context, we might naturally call them cir-
cumstantial, though even then the use of the Imperfect at the outset
would be unaccountable.   But, as all agree, they do not describe
what happened at that time, nor anything that it is important to
mention as an elucidation of the context.   In order to secure even
any appearance of connection of thought, we are obliged to read into
the passage what is not in the faintest manner suggested by it.   Thus
it might be imagined that the author, while telling of Moses' confer-
ence with Jehovah, was led to think of the tabernacle in which the
conference took place, and threw in at that point this bit of historical
information about it.   But why interject this information into the
very midst of the narrative ?   Why not at least wait till the close of
the account of the conference ?   And then especially, why not inti-
mate in some manner that the conference really did take place in the
tabernacle ?   The one thing which alone would justify, or at least in
some degree account for, such an interruption of the narrative, is
wholly omitted.   The case of ver. 6, as related to the context, is
quite different.   It is an interruption, indeed, in one sense; but it
has an obvious connection with the context.   It is, moreover, not a
circumstantial clause, for it is connected with the foregoing by the
Vav Consecutive.—We must, then, account for the position of the
subject of the sentence by regarding it as emphatic.   There may,
indeed, appear to be no special need of emphasis here; but there is
certainly as much as in Gen. i. 20, 22, above referred to, or as in
Gen. iv. 18.   The contrast is between the people who (ver. 5) are
punished for their sin, and Moses, who, not having been implicated
in their sin, is to enjoy the privilege of peculiar intimacy with
Jehovah.

4. One more objection may be urged, viz., that there is a particu-
larity of detail in the passage before us, which seems more appropri-
ate as belonging to a historical narrative than as belonging to a direc-
tion or a threat, especially if, as in the present case, the threat is not
to be carried out, and is revoked even before being communicated to

the people whom it concerns.   This is to my mind the only serious objection to the interpretation above advocated.   If there were not still more serious objections to the ordinary view, this might be enough to decide the verdict in favor of the historical construction of the passage.   But the weight of this objection is much diminished by the following considerations.   (a) No difficulty is to be found in the mere fact that the threat is not fully executed.   It might *a priori* appear to be inconsistent with the divine character to suppose that God could utter a threat which he is immediately induced to retract by human intercession.   But in view of the multitude of instances in which God is said to have repented of his own acts, and to have been moved by the sufferings and prayers of his children, we must relax the rigor of the speculative doubt.   More particularly, we have instances of threats prophetically uttered, but retracted before being executed, *e. g.* the prophecies concerning Ahab (1 Kings xxi. 18–29), Rehoboam (2 Chron. xii. 5–12), Nineveh (Jonah iii.), and Micah's prophecy (iii. 12), declared in Jerem. xxvi. 18, 19 not to have been executed on account of the people's repentance.   The difficulty, then, is not at all in the mere fact that what is here prescribed is not carried out; it is only in the fact that there is more circumstantiality in the directions than is elsewhere found in unfulfilled threats.   As to this, however, it is to be remarked (b) that there is no occasion for assuming that *all* of these directions were unfulfilled.   In fact, the only particular of which it can certainly be said that it was revoked is the one concerning the pitching of the tent outside of the camp.   All that is said, especially, about Moses' going into it to receive divine communications was of permanent validity.

I have attempted to give full weight to all possible objections against the proposed interpretation.   None of them seem to be of decisive weight, especially when compared with the much greater objections which lie against the common translation.

"The Everlasting Father."

BY REV. T. W. CHAMBERS, D. D.

In Isaiah ix. 6, 7, there is a remarkable prediction of a child who is justly to bear titles of a very extraordinary character. One of these titles is rendered in our Authorized Version, The Everlasting Father—the Hebrew being אֲבִי־עַד. The force of this phrase, it is proposed now to consider. It is agreed by all that the first noun is in the construct state, and that its primary meaning is *father*. The only questions that arise are as to the nature of the genitive and the meaning of the second noun.

1. An early opinion, originating with Abarbanel, and afterwards adopted by Hitzig, Knobel, and Kuenen, gives to עַד the sense of *booty*, a meaning which it certainly has in Gen. xlix. 27, Isaiah xxxiii. 23, and Zeph. iii. 8, where, however, the connection imperatively requires it. In all other cases, nearly fifty in number, it denotes *perpetuity*. Nor is there any reason for departing from the ordinary sense here, since there is nothing in the attributes of the peaceful and righteous Ruler to suggest that he is a plundering conqueror who reigns by violence and fills his treasury with spoils, but, on the contrary, much that points in another direction.

2. A second rendering is that of the A. V., which retains the usual meaning of both words and makes the genitive one of attribute—Father of everlasting=Everlasting Father. Thus Gesenius, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, and Maurer. This is certainly a possible rendering, since we have in Hab. (iii. 6) הַרְרֵי־עַד, where no one doubts that the second noun represents a quality of the first, viz., perpetuity. The difficulty in adopting this view here is the fact that it gives to the subject of the prophecy a title which is never applied to the Messiah elsewhere in the S. S., and one which it is perplexing either to explain exegetically or to apply homiletically. Christ's relations to his

people are set forth in a vast variety of ways by the Sacred Writers, but never by any borrowed from the paternal tie—the word *father*, with all its boundless wealth of meaning, being reserved for the first person of the Godhead, the Father of all, while Messiah is over and over set forth in the New Testament as the brother of his people.

3. A third view makes the genitive one of authorship (*auctoris*).

a) Thus Grotius makes it=father of a numerous offspring.

b) The Douay version, with which Lowth agrees, identifying עַד with עוֹלָם, makes the phrase mean father of a new age, or, as the older version has it, father of the world to come. (LXX. [Alex. text] πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Vulg. *Pater futuri sæculi.*)

This again is a possible rendering, but certainly not probable. For it gives to the second noun a meaning which it has nowhere else in the Scriptures, and if Isaiah had intended to convey this sense he would have used עוֹלָם which was ready at his hand. Besides, the idea thus given makes no perceptible addition either in dignity or in efficacy to what has already been ascribed to the child whose name is wonderful. If he is mighty God, he is of course father or founder of the new age just as he was of all preceding ages.

(*c*) Another modification of this view regards the phrase as showing Messiah to be the author of eternity, *i. e.*, eternal life to his people. But while this is a certain and blessed truth, and one set forth with frequency and precision in the New Testament, it is not contained in the Old, except by implication. Nor does it seem natural to interject a purely spiritual conception like this into a description, which borrowing its terms from an earthly throne sets forth the inherent dignity of Messiah as a mighty, successful, peaceful and permanent monarch, the increase of whose government has no end. While the doctrine of immortality was certainly known to the ancient saints, yet it was not emphasized and repeated in such a way as to render it natural to expect that it would be identified with the person of Messiah so directly and distinctly as this interpretation would make it here.

4. A fourth view is that which makes the genitive one of possession. This is an Arabic usage of very common occurrence in ancient times and modern, but in Hebrew is found very rarely, and then only in proper names, *e. g.*, Abitub אֲבִי טוֹב father of goodness, *i. e.*, the good one. In Job xvii. 14, the patient man salutes the grave, saying, "Corruption, thou art my father," *i. e.*, corruption possesses me. And if we render שָׁחַת by *pit*, as some contend that we always

should, the sense is the same. If this view be adopted then we have the phrase indicating eternity as an attribute of the Messiah. He is self-existing and ever-living—a sense which admirably accords with the whole connection, especially the preceding clause. The prophet after saying that the future deliverer is the mighty God, specifies one of the divine perfections, that incommunicable excellence by which Jehovah is the first cause and last end of all things. Father of eternity because it is He that gives substance and body to the conception of infinite duration. Duration implies something that endures. Now God is the Being who having neither beginning of days nor end of years gives to us the concrete meaning of the abstract statement. And to ascribe this attribute to the Messiah, to him who is to be born as a child, is exactly in line with the rest of the marvellous prediction, and gives increased emphasis and meaning to the startling collocation of human qualities and divine in the future ruler of Israel. Born in time and seated on the throne of David, he is yet the Everlasting One, whose goings forth have been from of old, even from the days of eternity. Of the increase of his government there shall be no end, just because of his existence there has been no beginning.

Finally, whatever be the meaning of the phrase, the English translation should be "father of eternity" in accordance witth the ancient Arabic and the modern (Dr. Van Dyck's), the Syriac, ancient* and modern, the Chaldee Paraphrase, the French of Martin and the Dutch of the States Bible.

---

*That is, in the Ambrosian Codex, for the text in the London Polyglott omits the first word of the phrase and reads "mighty God of eternity."

The Relation of Ezekiel to the Levitical Law.

BY PROF. FREDERIC GARDINER, D. D.

In the discussions which have arisen of late years about the origin and date of the Mosaic legislation it has been generally recognized that the book of Ezekiel, especially in its later chapters, has a peculiar importance. The traditional view regards the laws of the Pentateuch as having been given through Moses to the Israelites soon after their Exodus from Egypt, and as having formed in all subsequent ages their more or less perfectly observed standard of ecclesiastical law and religious ceremonial; the view of several modern critics, on the other hand, is that this legislation was of gradual development, having its starting point, indeed, quite far back in the ages of Israel's history, but reaching its full development only in the times succeeding the Babylonian exile. Especially, the exclusive limitation of the functions of the priesthood to the Aaronic family, and the distinction between the priests and their brethren of the tribe of Levi, as well as the cycle of the feasts and other like matters, are held by these critics to be of post-exilic origin.

The writings of a priest who lived during the time of the exile, and who devotes a considerable part of his book to an ideal picture of the restored theocracy, its temple, its worship, and the arrangement of the tribes, cannot fail to be of deep significance in its bearing upon this question. Certain facts in regard to Ezekiel are admitted by all: he was himself a priest (i. 3); he had been carried into captivity not before he had reached early manhood; and, whether he had himself ministered in the priest's office at Jerusalem (as Kuenen positively asserts, *Relig. of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 105) or not, he was certainly thoroughly conversant with the ceremonial as there practiced and with the duties of the priesthood; further, he began his prophecies a few years after Zedekiah was carried into captivity, and continued them until near the middle of the Babylonian exile, the last nine chapters being dated ''in the 25th year of our captivity,'' which corresponds with the

33d of Nebuchadrezzar's reign. If any development of Israel's religion, therefore, were going on during the captivity, it must have been already well advanced at the time of this vision. So far there is a general agreement. The main point necessarily follows:—that in such case Ezekiel's vision must present an intermediate stage on the line of progress from that which we certainly know to have existed before to that which we know, with equal certainty, was practiced afterwards.

It is indeed theoretically conceivable that in the course of this development of religion Ezekiel may have been a strange, erratic genius, who was both regardless of the traditions of his fathers and was without influence upon the course of his successors; but such strange estimation of him is entertained by no one, and needs no refutation. It would be contradicted by his birth, his position as a prophet, his evident estimation among his contemporaries, and his relations to his fellow prophet-priest, Jeremiah. It may be assumed that his writings were an important factor in whatever religious development actually occurred.

This argument is the more important on account of the great weight attached by some critics to the argument *e silentio*. This argument can be only of limited application in regard to historical books, fully occupied as they are with other matters, and only occasionally and incidentally alluding to existing ecclesiastical laws and customs; but it is plainly of great importance in this prophetical setting forth of quite a full and detailed ecclesiastical scheme. The omission of references to any ritual law or feast or ceremony in the historical books can occasion no surprise, and afford no just presumption against the existence of such rites and ceremonies, unless some particular reason can be alleged why they should have been mentioned; but a corresponding omission from the pages of Ezekial is good evidence either that the thing omitted was too familiar to require mention, or else that he purposely excluded it from his scheme. In other words, it shows that what he omits, as compared with the mosaic law, was either already entirely familiar to him and to the people; or else that the law he sets forth was, in these particulars, different from the Mosaic law. To illustrate by an example: There can be no question that circumcision was a fundamental rite of the religion of the Israelites, practiced in all ages of their history; yet, after the Pentateuch and the few first chapters of Joshua, there is no mention of it, and the words *circumcise, circumcised, circumcision,* do not occur in the sacred literature down to the time of Jeremiah; neither does the word *foreskin*, except in connection with David's giving the foreskins of the

Philistines as dowry for Michal (1 Sam. xviii. 25, 27; 2 Sam. iii. 14). Even *uncircumcised*, as a designation of the enemies of Israel, occurs only nine times (Judg. xiv. 3; xv. 18; 1 Sam. xiv. 6; xvii. 26, 36; xxxi. 4; 2 Sam. i. 20; 1 Chron. x. 4; Isa. lii. 1) in the interval, and several of these passages are considered by the critics to be of later date; neither is there any allusion to circumcision in Ezekiel, except the mention of the stranger "uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh" (xliv. 7, 9). Of course, the reason for this, in both cases, is that the law of circumcision was so familiar and the practice so universal that there was no occasion for its mention. On the other hand, the fast of the day of atonement is not mentioned either in the historical books or in Ezekiel. We are not surprised at its omission from the former, nor can this cast any shade of doubt on its observance, unless some passage can be shown in which it would have been likely to be spoken of; but we can only account for its being passed over in the cycle of the festivals in Ezekiel on the supposition that it formed no part of his scheme, while yet, as will be shown farther on, there are indications that he recognizes it, in his other arrangements, as existing in his time.

While abundant references to the Mosaic law may be found in every part of Ezekiel,* it has seemed best to confine the present investigation to the last nine chapters, both because these are by far the most important in this connection, and also because these have been chiefly used in the discussion of the subject. Unfortunately, there is a difference of opinion in regard to the general interpretation of these chapters. Some will have them to be literally understood as the expression of the prophet's hope and expectation of what was actually to be; more generally the vision is looked upon as a figurative description of the future glory of the church, clothed, as all such descriptions must necessarily be, in the familiar images of the past. A determination of this question is not absolutely necessary to the present discussion, but is so closely connected with it, and the argument will be so much clearer when this has first been examined, that it will be well to give briefly some of the reasons for considering Ezekiel's language in this passage to be figurative.†

It is evident that Ezekiel's description differs too widely from the past to allow of the supposition that it is historical; and written at a

---

*For a very ample list of quotations and allusions to the law in Ezekiel, see pp. 105–110 in *A Study of the Pentateuch, for Popular Reading*, &c. By Rufus P. Stebbins, D. D. (Boston, 1881).

† This question is treated more fully in my notes upon these chapters in Bp. Ellicott's *Commentary for English Readers*.

time when the temple lay in ashes and the land desolate, it cannot refer to the present.   It must then have reference to the future.   The presumption is certainly that it portrays an ideal future, because the whole was seen "in the visions of God" (xl. 2), an expression which Ezekiel always applies to a symbolic representation rather than to an actual image of things (cf. i. 1; viii. 3; also xi. 24, and xliii. 3). Moreover, if it is to be literally understood, it must portray a state of things to be realized either in the near future, or else at a time still in advance of our own day.   If the former, as is supposed by a few commentators, it is plain that the prophecy was never fulfilled, and remains a monument of magnificent purposes unaccomplished.   The attempt to explain this by the theory that the returning exiles found themselves too few and feeble to carry out the prophet's whole designs, and therefore concluded to postpone them altogether to a more convenient season, must be regarded as an entire failure.   For one of two suppositions must be adopted, both of them leading to the same result: either that of the negative critics—that certain great features of the Mosaic law, such as the distinction between the priests and Levites and the general priestly legislation, had their origin with Ezekiel; and in this case it is inconceivable that, while adopting this, no attention should have been paid to the authority of this great prophet in other matters; or else we must accept the commonly received view, that the Mosaic law was earlier, and is here profoundly modified by Ezekiel.   In the latter case, however much the returning exiles might have been disappointed in their circumstances, yet if they understood the prophet literally, they must have looked forward to the accomplishment of his designs in the future, and would naturally have been anxious to order the restored theocracy on his plan, as far as they could, from the first, to avoid the necessity of future changes; and a large part of the scheme, such as the cycle of the feasts, the ordering of the sacrifices, &c., was quite within their power.   In either case, if the vision is to be taken literally, it is inexplicable that there should be no reference to it in the historical books of Ezra and Nehemiah and the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, which all relate to this period, and describe the return and settlement in the land, and the rebuilding of the temple.

It is scarcely necessary to speak of a literal fulfilment still in the future.   Ordinarily it is difficult to say that any state of things may not possibly be realised in the future; but here there are features of the prophecy, and those neither of a secondary nor incidental character, which enable us to assert positively that their literal fulfilment would be a plain contradiction of the Divine revelation.   It is impos-

sible to conceive, in view of the whole relations between the old and
new dispensations, that animal sacrifices can ever be restored by
Divine command and with acceptance to God.   And, it may be added,
it is equally impossible to suppose that the church of the future, pro-
gressing in the liberty wherewith Christ has made it free, should ever
return to "the weak and beggarly elements" of Jewish bondage here
set forth.

Having thus alluded to these general presumptions, we are pre-
pared to look at those particular indications which have been intro-
duced into the prophecy itself as if to show that it is to be under-
stood ideally.   I do not propose to speak of those more general
indications, such as the regularity of proportions and forms, the sym-
metry of measurements &c., which here, as in the later chapters of
the apocalypse, give to almost every reader a somewhat indefinable
but very strong impression of the ideality of the whole description;
but will confine myself to statements which admit of definite tests in
regard to their literalness.

In the first place, the connection between the temple and the city
of Jerusalem in all the sacred literature of the subject, as well as in
the thought of every pious Israelite, is so close that a prophecy inci-
dentally separating them, without any distinct statement of the fact or
of the reason for so doing, could hardly have been intended, or have
been understood literally.   Yet in this passage the temple is described
as at a distance of nearly nine and a half miles from the utmost
bound of the city, or about fourteen and a quarter miles from its
centre.*

A temple in any other locality than Mount Moriah could hardly be
the temple of Jewish hope and association.   The location of Ezekiel's
temple depends upon whether the equal portions of land assigned to

---

*This holds true, however the tribe portions of the land and the
"oblation" are located; for the priests' portion of the "oblation," in the
midst of which the sanctuary is placed, (xlviii. 10) is 10,000 reeds, or
about nineteen miles broad; to the south of this (xlviii. 15–17) is a strip
of land of half the width, in which the city is situated, occupying with
its "suburbs" its whole width.   These distances, in their exactness,
depend upon the length of the cubit which is variously estimated.   For
the purposes of this discussion it is taken at a convenient average of the
conflicting estimates, viz: 20 inches.   If it were a little more or a little
less the general argument would remain the same.   There should
also be noticed the view of a few writers (Henderson on xlv. 1; Hengs-
tenberg on xlv. 1, and a few others) that the dimensions given in this
chapter are to be understood of *cubits* and not of reeds; but this is so
generally rejected, and is in itself so improbable that it seems to require
no discussion.   Even if adopted, it would only change the amount of
the distance and would still leave the temple quite outside the city and
separated from it by a considerable space.

each of the tribes in ch. xlviii. were actually equal in area, or were only strips of equal width. The latter view is, so far as I know, adopted by all commentators. On this supposition Ezekiel's city would be several miles north of Jerusalem, and the temple, still north of that, would be well on the road to Samaria. On the other supposition, it would fall nearly in the latitude of Hebron.

In either case, the temple, with its precincts, is described as a mile square, or larger than the whole ancient city of Jerusalem. In xliii. 12 it is expressly said "that the whole limit thereof round about" is "upon the top of the mountain." But without pressing this, it is hardly possible that the precincts of any actual temple could be intended to embrace such a variety of hill and valley as would be involved.

Moreover, the description of the "oblation" itself is physically impossible. The boundaries of the land are expressly said to be the Mediterranean on the one side and the Jordan on the other (xlvii. 15–21). The eastern boundary is not formed by an indefinite extension into the desert, but is distinctly declared to be the Jordan, and above that, the boundaries of Hauran and Damascus. It is substantially the same with that given in Num. xxxiv. 10–12, and in both cases excludes the trans-Jordanic territory which was not a part of Palestine proper, and in which, even after its conquest, the two and a half tribes had been allowed to settle with some reluctance (Num. xxxii.). Now, if the portions of the tribes were of equal width, the "oblation" could not have been extended so far south as the mouth of the Jordan; but even at that point the whole breadth of the country, according to the English "exploration fund" maps, is only 55 miles. Measuring northwards from this point the width of the oblation, 47⅓ miles, a point is reached where the distance between the river and the sea is only 40 miles. It is impossible therefore that the oblation itself should be included between them, and the description requires that there should also be room left for the prince's portion at either end. It has been suggested that the prophet might have had in mind measurements made on the uneven surface of the soil or along the usual routes of travel; but both these suppositions are absolutely excluded by the symmetry and squareness of this description.

Again: the city of the vision is described as the great city of the restored theocracy; but, as already said, it cannot be placed geographically upon the site of Jerusalem. Either, then, this city must be understood ideally, or else a multitude of other prophecies, and notably many of Ezekiel which speak of Zion and of Jerusalem, must be so interpreted. There is no good reason why both may not

be figurative, but it is impossible to take both literally; for some of them make statements in regard to the future quite as literal in form as these, and yet in direct conflict with them. Such prophecies, both in Ezekiel and in the other prophets, in regard to Jerusalem, are too familiar to need citation; yet one, on a similar point, from a prophet not much noticed, may be given as an illustration. Obadiah (according to some authorities, a contemporary of Ezekiel) foretells (ver. 19) that at the restoration '' Benjamin shall possess Gilead''; but according to Ezekiel, Gilead is not in the land of the restoration at all, and Benjamin's territory is to be immediately south of the '' oblation.'' Again, Obadiah (ver. 20) says, '' The captivity of Jerusalem'' (which in distinction from ''the captivity of the host of the children of Israel,'' must refer to the two tribes) '' shall possess the cities of the south''; but according to Ezekiel, Judah and Benjamin are to adjoin the central '' oblation,'' and four other tribes are to have their portions south of them. Such instances might easily be multiplied. It must surely be a false exegesis which makes the prophets gratuitously contradict each other and even contradict themselves (as in this case of Obadiah) almost in the same sentence.

The division of the land among the twelve tribes; the assignment to the priests and the Levites of large landed estates, and to the former as much as to the latter; the enormous size of the temple precincts and of the city, with the comparatively small allotment of land for its support, are all so singular, and so entirely destitute of either historical precedent or subsequent realization, that only the clearest evidence would justify the assumption that these things were intended to be literally carried out. No regard is paid to the differing numbers of the tribes, but—as if to set forth an ideal equality—an equal strip of land is assigned to each; and, the trans-Jordanic territory being excluded and about one-fifth of the whole land being set apart as an '' oblation,'' the portion remaining allows to each of the tribes only about two-thirds as much territory as, on the average, they had formerly possessed. The geographical order of the tribes is also extremely singular, and bears all the marks of ideality. Moreover, nearly the whole territory assigned to Zebulon and Gad is habitable only by nomads.

A further difficulty with the literal interpretation may be found in the description of the waters which issued from under the eastern threshold of the temple (xlvii. 1–12). This difficulty is so great that some commentators, who have adopted generally a literal interpretation, have found themselves constrained to resort here to the figurative; but on the whole, it has been recognized that the vision is essentially

one, and that it would be unreasonable to give a literal interpretation
to one part of it and a figurative to another.   The waters of the vision
run to the "east country," and go down "to the sea," which can only
be the Dead Sea; but such a course would be physically impossible
without changes in the surface of the earth, since the location of the
temple of the vision is on the west of the water-shed of the country. *
They had, moreover, the effect of "healing" the waters of the sea,
an effect which could not be produced naturally without providing an
outlet from the sea, and Ezekiel (xlvii. 11) excludes the idea of an
outlet.   No supply of fresh water could remove the saltness, while
this was all disposed of by evaporation.   But, setting aside minor
difficulties, the character of the waters themselves is impossible, ex-
cept by a perpetual miracle.   Without insisting upon the strangeness
of a spring of this magnitude upon the top of "a very high moun-
tain" (xl. 2; cf. also xliii. 12), at the distance of 1,000 cubits from
their source, the waters have greatly increased in volume; and so
with each successive 1,000 cubits, until at the end of 4,000 (about a
mile and a half) they have become a river no longer fordable, or, in
other words, comparable to the Jordan.   Such an increase, without
accessory streams, is clearly not natural.   Beyond all this, the descrip-
tion of the waters themselves clearly marks them as ideal.   They are
life-giving and healing; trees of perennial foliage and fruit grow upon
their banks, the leaves being for "medicine," and the fruit, although
for food, never wasting.   The reader cannot fail to be reminded of
"the pure river of water of life" in Rev. xxii. 1, 2. "on either side"
of which was "the tree of life," with "its twelve manner of fruits"
and its leaves "for the healing of the nations."   The author of the
Apocalypse evidently had this passage in mind; and just as he has
seized upon the description of Gog and Magog in chaps. xxxviii.,
xxxix., as an ideal description, and applied it to the events of the
future, so he has treated this as an ideal prophecy, and applied it to
the Church triumphant.

Finally, it should be remembered that this whole vision is inti-
mately bound together, and all objections which lie against a literal
interpretation of any one part, lie also against the whole.   Additional
reasons for spiritual interpretation will incidentally appear in the fol-
lowing pages.

If it is now asked—and this seems to be the chosen ground of the

*This is true with any possible location of the "oblation"; for the
central point between the Jordan and the Mediterranean is well on the
western water-shed at every locality from the head waters of the Jordan
to the extremity of the Dead Sea.

literal interpreters—why then is this prophecy given with such a
wealth of minute material detail? the answer is obvious, that this is
thoroughly characteristic of Ezekiel. The tendency to a use of con-
crete imagery, strongly marked in every part of his book, merely cul-
minates in this closing vision. The two previous chapters, especially,
have abounded in definite material details of the attack of a great host
upon the land of Israel, while these very details, upon examination,
show that they were not meant to be literally understood, and that
the whole prophecy was intended to shadow forth the great and final
spiritual conflict, prolonged through ages, between the power of the
world and the kingdom of God. So here, the prophet, wishing to
set forth the glory, the purity, and the beneficent influence of the
church of the future, clothes his description in those terms of the past
with which his hearers were familiar. The use of such terms was a
necessity in making himself intelligible to his contemporaries; just as
to the very close of the inspired volume it is still necessary to set forth
the glory and joy of the church triumphant under the figures of earthly
and familiar things, but no one is misled thereby to imagine that the
heavenly Jerusalem will be surrounded by a literal wall of jasper
1,500 miles high (Rev. xxi, 16, 18), or that its 12 gates shall be each
of an actual pearl. At the same time the prophet is careful to intro-
duce among his details so many impossible points as to show that his
description must be ideal, and its realisation be sought for beneath
the types and shadows in which it is clothed. It may be as impossi-
ble to find the symbolical meaning of each separate detail as it is to
tell the typical meaning of the sockets for the boards of the tabernacle,
although the tabernacle as a whole is expressly said to have been a
type. This is the case with every vision, and parable, and type, and
every form of setting forth truth by imagery; there must necessarily
be much which has no independent signification, but is merely sub-
sidiary to the main point. Ezekiel's purpose was so far understood
by his contemporaries that they never made any attempt to carry out
his descriptions in the rebuilding of the temple and the reconstruc-
tion of the State. The idea of a literal interpretation of his words was
reserved for generations long distant from his time, from the forms of
the church under which he lived, and from the circumstances and
habits of expression with which he was familiar, and under the
influence of which he wrote.

With this unavoidably prolonged discussion the ground is cleared
for a comparison of the *cultus* set forth in this vision of Ezekiel with

that commanded in the Mosaic law, and an examination of the relation between them.   This discussion is embarrassed by the difficulty of finding any historical data which will be universally accepted.   If we might assume that any of the older historical books of the Old Testament were as trustworthy as ordinary ancient histories making no claim to inspiration, or that the books of most of the prophets were not pious frauds, the task would be greatly simplified.   As it is, I shall endeavor to conduct the examination on the basis of such obvious facts as would be admitted by the authors of what seem to the writer such strange romances as Kuenen's "Religion of Israel" and "Prophets and Prophecy in Israel."*

The first point to which attention may be called is the landed property of the priests and Levites.   According to the Mosaic law, they had no inheritance of land like the other tribes, but merely scattered cities for residence; and were to depend for support, partly upon their portion of the sacrifices, and chiefly upon the tithes of the people. While the payment of these tithes was commanded, there was absolutely no provision for enforcing their payment.   This rested entirely upon moral obligation, and the condition of the whole Levitical tribe was thus dependent upon the conscientiousness of the Israelites. When the sense of religious obligation was strong, they would be well provided for; when it was weak, they would be in want.   And this is exactly what appears from the general course of the history, as well as from such special narratives as are universally admitted to be of great antiquity.   (See Judg. xvii. 7–18, &c.)   Now, after the exile, at a time when there can be no question in regard to the facts, we find the priests and Levites similarly unprovided with landed property.   The Mosaic law, the condition of things before the exile and after, agree together; but Ezekiel represents a totally different state of things.   He assigns two strips of territory, one to the priests and the other to the Levites, each of nearly the same size as the allotment to any of the tribes (xlviii. 9–14).   This very small tribe would thus have had almost twice as much land as any other; and such a provision would obviously have profoundly modified the whole state and relations of the priestly order and of the subordinate Levites. In this point, therefore, we find that if any process of development was going on in the ecclesiastical system of Israel, it was such as to

---

*Substantially the same views, especially in relation to Ezekiel, are taken by Graf (*Die Geschichtl. Bücher des alten Test.*), Smend (*Der Prophet Ezechiel*), and others, with sundry variations in detail; but as Kuenen is the author most widely known, and presents his theories in the most favorable point of view, the references of this paper will be confined to his works.

leave the final result just what it had been before, while the system of Ezekiel, which, on that supposition, should be a middle term between the two, is entirely foreign to both of them.

There are other noteworthy points involved in the same provision. According to Deut. xix. 2–9 three cities, and conditionally another three, and according to Num. xxxv. 9–15 the whole six, were to be selected from the cities of the Levites and appointed as cities of refuge in case of unintentional manslaughter. The same provision is alluded to in Ex. xxi. 13, 14, and it plainly forms an essential feature of the whole Mosaic law in regard to manslaughter and murder. After the conquest, according to Josh. xxi. this command was executed and the cities were distributed as widely as possible in different parts of the land, three of them on either side of the Jordan, the eastern side being considered as an extension of the land not included in the original promise and therefore bringing into force the conditional requirement of Deuteronomy.* But by the arrangement of Ezekiel, the Levites were not to have cities scattered through the land, and their central territory could not afford the necessary ease of access from the distant parts. There is here therefore an essential difference in regard to the whole law in reference to manslaughter and murder, and it is plain that the Mosaic law in this point could not have been devised from Ezekiel.

But besides this obvious inference, it is in the highest degree improbable that this provision of the Mosaic law could have originated after the captivity, when it would have been entirely unsuited to the political condition of the people. Still more, it is inconceivable that the record of the execution of this law by Joshua could have been invented after the time of Ezekiel; for neither in his vision is any such selection of cities indicated, nor in the actual territorial arrangement of the restoration was there any opportunity therefor. Yet the same account which records the selection (incidentally mentioned in connection with each city as it is reached in the list) clearly recognizes the distinction between the priests and the Levites (Josh. xxi.) This distinction then must have been older than Ezekiel.

In quite another point Ezekiel's assignment of territory, taken in connection with Numbers and Joshua, has an important bearing upon the antiquity of the distinction between priests and Levites. According to the Mosaic law the priests were a higher order ecclesiastically

---

* Deuteronomy was indeed written after the conquest of the trans-Jordanic territory; but it was immediately after, and when this territory was yet hardly considered as the home of the tribes. Some writers prefer to consider the number of six cities as fixed and the three conditional, which in their view were never set apart, as making nine.

than the Levites and in accordance with this position, were provided
with a more ample income; for being much less than a tenth of the
tribe, the priests received a tenth of the income of all the other Levites
(Num. xviii. 25-28).   Both these facts are in entire accordance with
the relations of the priests and Levites in post-exilic times; but they
are at variance with those relations as set forth in Joshua, if that be
post-exilic, and also with Ezekiel considered as a preparatory stage of
the legislation of the Pentateuch.   Of course, the whole body of the
Levites must have been originally many times more numerous than
the members of the single family of Aaron, and if Joshua xxi. be very
ancient we need not be surprised that the 48 Levitical cities provided
for in Numbers (xxxv. 1-7) should have been given, 13 to the priests
and 35 to the other Levites (Josh. xxi.); for this gave to the priests
individually a much larger proportion than to the Levites.   The same
thing is true of the provision made by Ezekiel.   The equal strips of
land given to the priests collectively and to the Levites collectively,
gave much more to the former individually.   But all this would have
been entirely untrue after the exile.   In the census of the returning
exiles, given in both Ezra and Nehemiah, the number of priests is set
down as 4289 (Ezra ii. 36-38; Neh. vii. 39-42), while that of the
Levites—even including the *Nethinim*—is 733, or but little more than
one-sixth of that number (Ez. ii. 40-58; in Neh. vii, 43—60 the
number is 752).*   It may indeed be argued that Ezekiel has no re-
gard to the actual numbers of the two bodies, but writing at an early
stage of the process of separation between the priests and the Levites,
intends to put them upon a precise equality; and that only at a later
period was the pecuniary provision for the Levites made inferior to
that of the priests.   If this be so, then Joshua xxi. must be post-
exilic; for in its whole arrangement it clearly recognizes the distinc-
tion and the superiority of the priests.   Yet this gives 35 cities to the
very few Levites and only 13 to the comparatively numerous priests—

---

*Kuenen (*Relig. of Isr.* Vol. II. p. 203, 204) and his school undertake
to explain this disparity of numbers by the supposition that the Levites
were "degraded priests " of which he thinks he finds evidence in Ezek.
xliv. 10-16.   For the present point this is quite immaterial; all that is
here required is admitted by him—the fact of the great disparity in num-
bers.   But the supposition itself is quite gratuitous, and rests upon two
unfounded assumptions: (1) that " the Levites " in ver. 10 cannot be
used κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν for the priests—a point to be spoken of elsewhere; and
(2) that the "sons of Zadok" ver. 15, is synonymous with "sons of
Aaron," which is not true.   The simple and natural explanation of the
passage in Ezekiel is that the prophet means to degrade the *priests* who
have been guilty of idolatry.   (See Curtiss' *The Levitical Priests* p.
74-77.)

in other words is self-contradictory. In this respect the bearing of Ezekiel is plain; it makes the Mosaic law and the history of Joshua consistent if they were ancient, but inconsistent and self-contradictory if Ezekiel's vision was a stage in the late differentiation of the priests from the Levites.

We are now prepared to go a step further. It is agreed on all sides that Ezekiel recognizes a distinction between the priests and the Levites. To an ordinary reader of his book it appears that he makes this recognition incidentally and as a matter of course, as of an old, familiar, and established distinction. He nowhere states that there shall be such a distinction, nor gives any grounds upon which it shall rest, nor describes who shall be included in the one body and who in the other, except that he confines the priests to "the sons of Zadok" (xl. 46; xliii. 19; xliv. 15; xlviii. 11), of which more will be said presently. Certainly this does not look, upon the face of it, like the original institution of this distinction. But Kuenen (*Relig. of Isr.* vol. 2 p. 116) asserts that at the time of Josiah's reformation, "all the Levites, without exception, were considered qualified to serve as priests of Jahweh," and that "Ezekiel is the first to desire other rules *for the future;*" and that the priestly laws of the Pentateuch, of which he had no knowledge, were subsequent. Again he says (ib. p. 153) "Ezekiel, in uttering his wishes as to the future, made a beginning of committal to writing of the priestly tradition. The priests in Babylonia went on in his footsteps. A first essay in priestly legislation—remains of which have been preserved to us in Lev. xviii–xxvi.—was followed by others, until at last a complete system arose, contained in an historical frame. Possessed of this system, the priestly exiles, and among them Ezra in particular, could consider themselves entitled and called upon to come forward as teachers in Judea, and to put in practice the ordinances which hitherto had been exclusively of theoretical interest to them."* These passages are cited from Kuenen simply to bring distinctly before the mind the theory which has recently gained acceptance with an intelligent school of critics; it is the bearing upon this of the vision of Ezekiel which we are to consider. The question to be asked is whether the more careful examination of this vision bears out the *prima facie* impression produced by it, or confirms the somewhat elaborate theory of Kuenen.

There can be no manner of doubt that in Ezekiel's time there already existed two classes of persons known respectively as "priests"

---

* He admits that the distinction is recognized in 1 Kings viii. 4, but says "this is merely in consequence of a clerical error." *Relig. Isr.* vol. II. p. 301.)

and as "Levites." Whatever may have been the ground of the distinction, and whether or not all were equally entitled to offer sacrifices, Ezekiel certainly recognizes the two classes as existing, since he could not otherwise have used the terms without defining them. The Levites, of course, may be considered already well known as the descendants of the tribe of Levi; but why not the priests in a similar way? How could he have used the term in distinction from the Levites, if no such distinction had been hitherto known?

But further: Ezekiel assigns to the priests the functions of offering the sacrifices and of eating the sin offering, while to the Levites he gives the duty of "ministering in the sanctuary." Of course the mere expression "minister" (xliv. 11) might, if it stood alone, be understood of any sort of service; but the whole context shows it is meant of a service inferior to the priests, and the existence here of the same distinctions as those of the Mosaic law has been so universally recognized as to lead some scholars to argue that the provisions of this law must have been derived from this prophet.   It is found however, that precisely the same distinction appears, and precisely the same duties are assigned respectively to the priests and to the Levites in the ages before Ezekiel.   There is no occasion to speak of the functions of the priests since there is no dispute about them; in regard to the Levites, I will refer only to a single passage already cited by Kuenen (*ubi sup.* p. 304) as pre-exilic, and of especial interest because it is taken from Deuteronomy (xviii. 1–8), and is partly in the same words as those used by Ezekiel. At first sight it appears to join the two classes together, but on closer examination is found to make a clear distinction between them.   "The priests the Levites, all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel; they shall eat the offerings of the Lord made by fire, and his inheritance" (vs. 1). This statement has been thought to show that the whole tribe was here treated as a unit, with no distinction between its members.   If it stood alone it might be so regarded; but the lawgiver immediately goes on to speak separately of the two parts of the tribe: "And this shall be the priests' due from the people, from them that offer a sacrifice," specifying the parts of the victim and also the first fruits; "for the Lord thy God hath chosen him out of all thy tribes to stand to minister in the name of the Lord, him and his sons forever." So far about the priests.   Then follows, "And if a Levite come from any of thy gates out of all Israel, where he sojourned, and come with all the desire of his mind unto the place which the Lord shall choose, then he shall minister in the name of the Lord his God, as all his brethren the Levites do, which stand before the Lord. They shall

have like portions to eat, besides that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony." There is here nothing, as in the case of the priests, about sacrifice; but the Levites appear to be inferior ministrants, just as in the Book of Numbers; and it is provided that any of the tribe, wherever he has before lived, may come and join himself to their number and share in the provision for their support, without regard to his private property. The supposition that the Levites referred to in these last verses were also priests, i. e. entitled to offer sacrifice, would be exegetically inadmissible; for they are said to "come from any of thy gates out of all Israel," while in Josh. xxi. 9–19 the cities of the priests (described also as the sons of Aaron) are confined to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Simeon. Consequently those who were to offer sacrifice could not "come from any of thy gates out of all Israel."* But independently of this fact, the priests are mentioned in Deuteronomy with their duties, then afterwards the Levites separately with their duties, which are not the same; and the point would require to be otherwise most clearly proved before it could be admitted that the persons were the same. Of course Ezekiel's vision, while it separates clearly the priests from the Levites, yet in assigning to each of them a compact territory, looks to an entirely different state of things from that contemplated in Numbers or fulfilled in Joshua.

Again: the expression "the priests the Levites" used seven times in Deuteronomy (xvii. 9, 18; xviii. 1; xxi. 5; xxiv. 8; xxvii. 9; xxxi. 9) and twice in Joshua (iii. 3; viii. 33) has been relied upon as a proof that the two classes were not distinguished when these books were written. That this argument will not apply to Joshua has already appeared, and Curtiss in his "Levitical Priests"† has shown that the same expression is used in the post-exilic books of Chronicles; but our concern is with Ezekiel. He has the expression twice (xlii. 19; xliv. 15) and each time with an addition which leaves no possible doubt of his meaning: "that be of the seed of Zadok" and "sons of Zadok." Hence the same reasoning which would make all Levites into priests in Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Chronicles, would make them all into "sons of Zadok" in Ezekiel.

But this leads to another fact in the prophet's description of the priesthood. As already said, he recognizes as the priests of the future

---

* This difficulty might be avoided by supposing Joshua to be later than Deuteronomy; but it has already been shown that this would only involve other and no less formidable difficulties on the other side.

† "The Levitical Priests, a contribution to the criticism of the Pentateuch." By S. J. Curtiss, jr., Ph. D. with a preface by Franz Delitzsch, Edinburgh and Leipzig, 1877.

only "the sons of Zadok (xl. 46; xliii. 19; xliv. 15; xlviii. 11).
Kuenen indeed seems to assume (*ubi sup.* p. 116) that "sons of
Zadok" and "sons of Aaron" are synonymous terms; it needs no
argument to show that they are really very different.   By universal
agreement, the priesthood was not of old restricted to the "sons of
Zadok," and it may be added, I suppose by the same universal
agreement, it was not so restricted afterwards.   The return of other
priests is mentioned by Ezra (ii. 36–39) and Nehemiah (vii. 39–42),
and I do not know that there has ever been any question that priests
of other families served in the temple in later ages.   Here then the
prophet is found, as in so many other cases, to be at variance alike
with the earlier and the later practice and with the Mosaic law, instead
of constituting a link between them.   If it be alleged that he pro-
posed to restrict the priesthood to the family of Zadok, but that this
was found impracticable and his successors carried out his plan as
far as they could, by restricting it to the wider family of Aaron, it may
well be asked, where is the proof of this?   Where is the thought or
suggestion anywhere outside of Ezekiel that such a narrower restric-
tion was ever desired or attempted?   If we look upon the prophet's
description as ideal, the whole matter is plain enough.   "The sons
of Zadok," in view of the facts of history, are the faithful priests, and
only such would Ezekiel have to minister; but as a scheme for a
change in the actual and literal priesthood, the whole matter is inex-
plicable.

Another point in which Ezekiel differs from the Mosaic ritual is in
regard to the persons who were to slay the ordinary sacrificial victims.
According to Lev. i. 5, 11; iii. 2, 8, 13; iv. 4 (cf. 15), 24, 29, 33,
the victim was to be killed by the one who made the offering, and
according to Ex. xii. 6, the same rule was to be observed with regard
to the Passover.   This was apparently the custom in all ages.   The
language of Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 9. § 1), although not very clear,
favors this supposition, and the record in 2 Chron. xxix. 20, ss., 34;
xxx. 17 seems decisive.   In this post-exilic book, in the account of
the purification of the sanctuary under Hezekiah, the exceptional
sacrifices of the purification are said to be slain by the priests, and the
assistance of the Levites in flaying the victims is expressly excused on
account of the insufficiency in the number of the priests, while at the
subsequent Passover it is said "the Levites had the charge of the
killing the Passovers for everyone that was not clean."   These excuses
for these acts imply that, in the time of the Chronicler, it was still the
custom for the people to kill their own sacrifices and for the priests to
flay them.   The Levitical law and the post-exilic custom (as well as

the pre-exilic) here agree as usual; but Ezekiel is quite apart from them and provides (xliv. 11) that the Levites "shall slay the burnt offering and the sacrifice for the people." Here again he is not at all in the line of a developing system. It may be added incidentally that the Samaritan Pentateuch shows what would have been the actual progress of development if it had existed in these matters in Israel; for, by changing the number of the pronouns and verbs in Leviticus, it makes the priests the slayers of the victims in all cases.

It has often been noticed that the office of high-priest is ignored in this vision, and an argument has been based on this fact to show that the writings of Ezekiel mark an early stage in the development of the Jewish hierarchy, when the precedence of the high-priest had not yet been established. The fundamental statement itself is not strictly true, and it will appear presently that the prophet, in several different ways, incidentally recognizes the existence of the high-priest and of some of the principal laws in relation to him. But the high-priest fills a prominent and important place in the Mosaic legislation, and if it could be shown on the one hand that there was no high-priest before the captivity, and on the other, that Ezekiel knew of none, it would certainly create a presumption that the laws of the priesthood might be of later origin. But the facts are so precisely opposite, that the maintenance of such propositions seems very strange. It may be well to refer again to Kuenen, as a fair exponent of this school of critics, to show that the non-existence of the high-priesthood before the captivity is distinctly maintained by them. He admits, indeed, "that one of the high-priests, who bore the title of *Kohên hagadôl* ['the high-priest'] or *Kohên rôsch* ['the head-priest'], at any rate from the days of Jehoash, stood at the head of the Jerusalem priests," but he associates him in honor and rank only with the three "door-keepers," and tells us that the various passages cited "teach us that one of the priests superintended the temple, or, in other words, kept order there, in which duty he was of course assisted by others"; and that "it follows, from 2 Kings xi. 18; xii. 12; Jer. xxix. 26, that this post was instituted by Jehoiada, the contemporary of King Jehoash" (*Relig. of Isr.* vol. II. p. 304). Again he marks emphatically, as one of the evidences of the late origin of the high-priesthood, that "the distinction between the duties of the priests and the high-priest, Lev. xxi. 1–9 and verses 10–15, does not occur at all in Ezekiel" (*ib.* p. 190). And still again (*ib.* p. 214), he represents that, even in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, the duties and authority of the high-priest were still in a vague and unsettled condition.

The point here to be determined is whether we have evidence of

the existence before the captivity of a high-priesthood as an import-
ant, regular office, transmitted by inheritance, and forming one of the
fundamental features of the Israelitish polity.   Of course, we could
not expect to find in such histories as have been preserved other than
meagre and incidental allusions to the details of the high-priest's
duties, his dress, and such matters.   Such allusions do occur, as in
the case of Ahimelech at the time of David's flight (1 Sam. xxi. 1–9).
and of the ephod of Abiathar (1 Sam. xxiii. 6, 9—observe that in
ver. 9 it is הָאֵפוֹד with the definite article), in connection with David's
enquiry of the Lord.   (Comp. also the charge against Ahimelech
that he "enquired of the Lord" for David.   1 Sam. xxii. 10, 15).
But the question is not about these matters of detail; the main point
is, that in Israel the priestly order had, and almost of necessity must
have had, especially in the times before the monarchy, an authorita-
tive and real head, as was the case with other nations of antiquity.
Even the exception here proves the rule, and we find that temporarily,
in one anomalous period of the history, during the reign of David,
there were two heads or high-priests, Zadok and Abiathar.   The
latter, after the slaughter of his father and kinsman by Saul, had fled
to David in his outlawry and had become, as he was entitled to
become by inheritance, his high-priest.   Meantime the office could
not be left in abeyance under the regular government, and when
David ascended the throne he found the high-priesthood occupied by
Zadok.   He did not presume to displace him, and neither would he
displace the faithful sharer of his own adversity; so it came about that
both were recognized.   This anomalous state of things was the more
tolerable because at the same time, according to the history, the ark
and the tabernacle were separated, while the duties of the high priest
were connected with both of them.   The high priest, or during the
period just mentioned, the two high priests, are mentioned in the fol-
lowing passages which are expressly cited by Kuenen (*Relig.* of *Isr.*
Note II. on ch. viii.   Vol. II., p. 304) as pre-exilic: 2 Sam. viii. 17;
xx. 25; 1 Ki. iv. 4; ii. 22, 26, 27; 2 Ki. xii. 10; xxii. 4, 8; xxiii. 4;
xxv. 18; Jer. xx. 1.   It is well known how greatly this list might be
extended, and also how often the high priest is mentioned in the
books of Joshua and 1 Samuel, the names of Eleazar, Phinehas, Eli
or Ahiah, being often given in connection with the office, besides
those of Ahimelech, Abiathar, Zadok, and Ahitub.   It would be
hard to find any single fact in the whole compass of Israelitish his-
tory in itself more probable or more abundantly attested than the
existence of the office of a real high priest, an important functionary

in the kingdom, the counsellor of the rulers, and whose especial office it was to "enquire of the Lord" and communicate His commands at important national emergencies. There is also perfectly clear and ample evidence of the continued existence of the same office after the captivity. Jeremiah (lii. 24–27) and the author of the second book of Kings (xxv. 18–21) give the name of the person who held the office at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, Seraiah, who was put to death by Nebuchadnezzar; while Ezra (ii. 2; iii. 2, 8, 9; iv. 3; v. 2; x. 18) and Nehemiah (vii. 7; xii. 1, 7, 10, 26) unite with Haggai (i. 1, 12, 14; ii., 2, 4) and Zechariah (iii. 1, 3, 6, 8, 9; vi. 11) in mentioning Joshua, or Jeshua, the son of Josedeck, as the high priest of the restoration. But Ezekiel's vision, it is said, recognizes no such office, and as will be seen presently, intentionally excludes it. Once more then, this vision not only gives no countenance, but is in direct opposition to the theory, that Ezekiel originated or was a direct link in the development of the priesthood from an earlier to a later differing form.

There is however, one curious point incidentally occurring in the vision which shows that Ezekiel was familiar with the office of high priest. In the various measurements of the temple and all its details given in chaps. xli., xlii., the prophet everywhere accompanies the measuring angel until he comes to the holy of holies. There the angel enters alone, as is shown by a sudden change in the language (xli. 3). This certainly has the appearance of a consciousness on the part of Ezekiel, the priest, that he might not enter there, and (since it cannot be supposed that this part of the temple was not to be entered at all) an allusion to that provision of the law by which entrance into the holy of holies was forbidden to all, save to the high priest only on the great day of atonement. I do not know of any other explanation, and if this be the true one, it shows that not only the high priest, but the principal Mosaic law in regard to him and also the day of atonement was known to the prophet.

That the omission of the high priest from this vision is not accidental but intentional is shown by the laws of the priesthood here set forth. These laws treat the priesthood as a single body without distinction and, considered only in themselves, admit of either of two interpretations: (1) on the development hypothesis, that they are original and general laws which were subsequently differentiated into the special stricter ones for the high priest, and the less strict for his brethren; or (2) that the specific laws were actually older than Ezekiel, but when he omitted the high priest from his scheme, he combined them into a certain mean between the two. The choice

between these two hypotheses is at once determined in favor of the latter if, as has already been shown, there was a real high priest in the previous ages. All reasonable ground of argument from these laws in favor of the development hypothesis is thus taken away; and not only so, but it is evident from the vision that Ezekiel knew of those stricter laws in regard to the high priest which did not apply to the priesthood in general. Besides the allusion already mentioned, the peculiarity of the prophet's laws appears especially in two points : in regard to marriage, and in regard to mourning. For the former, the Levitical law allowed the marriage of the ordinary priest to any but a profane or divorced woman, laying no restriction upon the marriage with a widow (Lev. xxi. 7); but it restricted the high priest to marriage with "a virgin of his own people" (*ib.* 14). Ezekiel makes a general compromise law for all, allowing marriage with a widow in case her former husband had been a priest (xliv. 22). The same thing is true of mourning. Ezekiel in general repeats literally the law of Lev. xxi. 1–3, 11–14, but while there is there a distinction between the high-priest and the ordinary priest, here there is one intermediate regulation. In Leviticus the ordinary priest might be "defiled for the dead" "for his kin that is near unto him," while this is in all cases whatever forbidden to the high-priest; in Ezekiel (xliv. 25–27) such defilement for the dead that "is near of kin" is allowed to all, but must be followed not only by the ordinary cleansing after contact with a dead body (see Num. xix. 11–17), but also by a second special period of seven days closed by a sin offering before the priest again enters upon the discharge of his duties. It will be noticed that there is here not only allusion to the laws of Leviticus, but also to a cleansing, apparently that prescribed in Numbers.

The regulations for the priests' dress (xliv. 17–19) require no especial notice. They are very brief; and as far as they go, are a simple reproduction of the provisions of Lev. xxviii. They have altogether the air of presupposing a knowledge of that law and specifying only a few particulars to recall the whole. As far as any inference is to be drawn from them, it is decidedly in favor of a recognition of the detailed precepts of Leviticus as already familiar.

We may now pass to the feasts and sacrifices and under this general head two points are to be considered : 1st, the changes in the ritual of the particular feasts and sacrifices, and 2d, the changes in the cycle of the feasts themselves. Under the former head the change which, if literally carried out, would have been the most striking one to the Israelite because most constantly before his mind, was that in the daily burnt offering. Ezekiel requires that there shall be a burnt

offering every morning; he says nothing whatever of an evening sac-
rifice and his language is justly thought to exclude the idea of one
(xlvi. 13–15). The Mosaic law commanded that there should be a
burnt offering *both* morning and evening (Ex. xxix. 38, 39; Num.
xxviii. 3, 4; cf. also Lev. vi. 8, 9). Is this an enlargement of, and
therefore later than Ezekiel's prescription? Of course this will depend
upon whether there is evidence of the custom of evening sacrifice
before the time of the exile. There are two passages which, as they
stand in our version, are clear and decisive upon this point. In 1
Ki. xviii. 36 it is said in connection with the controversy between
Elijah and the prophets of Baal on Mt. Carmel, "It came to pass at
the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that Elijah" &c.
Here this is evidently regarded as so fixed a custom as to suffice in
itself to make the hour. Again, in 2 Ki. xvi. 15, when Ahaz had
introduced his own idolatrous altar and yet wished the legal sacri-
fices to go on as usual, he "commanded Urijah the priest, saying,
upon the great altar burn the morning burnt offering, and the evening
meat offering" &c. Either of these passages, much more both of
them, would be entirely decisive were it not for the fact that the word
used for the evening sacrifice in both cases is מִנְחָה and it is urged that
this means an unbloody sacrifice. After the restoration also, when
Ezra on one occasion "sat astonied until the evening sacrifice" (Ezra
ix. 4) the word is the same. It is therefore suggested by some in-
terpreters that before and after the exile, as far as the time of Ezra, the
custom may have been to offer a burnt offering in the morning and
an unbloody oblation in the evening; and this interpretation is
thought to be confirmed by Ps. cxli. 2, "Let my prayer be set before
thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening מִנְחָה."
From this it is argued that the Mosaic law, being at variance with this
custom, and also with Ezekiel, must be of later origin; but if so, it
must be also later than the book of Daniel, (which these critics place
at 165 B. C.) for he also describes the hour of evening sacrifice as
"the time of the evening מִנְחָה" (ix. 21). As far as Ezekiel is
concerned, this argument is seen, on a moment's reflection, to have
no force; for it is just as difficult to account for his omission of a reg-
ular evening oblation as of a burnt offering. But the matter cannot
be left here, for the whole interpretation is wrong. The technical
meaning of מִנְחָה as an unbloody oblation belongs to the Levitical
law, and if this law be of later origin, as is claimed by some critics,
this sense cannot be carried back to an earlier time. Besides, this

oblation was never offered alone except in certain peculiar cases which
do not bear upon the question;* it was always an accompaniment of
the bloody sacrifice.   If, therefore, it could be proved—which it can-
not—that in 1 and 2 Kings and Ezra the unbloody oblation was
meant, it would yet remain that the mention of it implies and
involves also the animal sacrifice.   But the sense of the word outside
of the technical language of the law is very general, being applied to
an ordinary present (Gen. xxxii. 13 [14], 18 [19], 20 [21], 21 [22];
xxxiii. 10; xliii. 11, and frequently), or to tribute (Judg. iii. 15–18,
and frequently); and when this is a present to God, or sacrifice, it is
applied indifferently to the unbloody or to the animal sacrifice.
Thus it is used of the animal sacrifice of Abel as well as of the
unbloody offering of Cain (Gen. iv. 3–5); in 1 Sam. ii. 29 it is clearly
meant to include all sacrifices, but with especial reference to those of
animals; in 1 Sam. iii. 14 it is used with זֶבַח of a propitiatory sacri-
fice; in Mal. i. 13 it clearly refers to an animal sacrifice, since the
"torn, and the lame, and the sick" are mentioned.   In fact, it is a
general word for sacrifice of any kind, and while, following the
technical language of the law, it is often used specifically, and applied
to the unbloody, as distinguished from the animal sacrifice, yet it is
also used of sacrifice in general in such a way that it must be sup-
posed to include the animal sacrifice (see 1 Sam. ii. 17; xxvi. 19;
1 Chr. xvi. 29; Ps. xcvi. 8; Zeph. iii. 10; Mal. i. 10; ii. 12, 13;
iii. 3, 4).   There is therefore no ground for the theory that the eve-
ning מִנְחָה of 1 Kings xviii. 29; 2 Kings xvi. 15; and Ezra ix. 4,
refers to an unbloody offering.   In fact, the argument would prove
too much; for the same expression is used also of the morning sacri-
fice in 2 Kings iii. 20, "it came to pass in the morning, when the
מִנְחָה was offered."   It remains, therefore, that here, as elsewhere,
Ezekiel's provisions stand quite apart from the law and the custom,
and give no indication of being a step in the development of a *cultus.*

---

*The only certain exception is the offering of jealousy (Num. v. 15–26).
In addition, the unbloody oblation was allowed (Lev. ii. 1–9; vii. 9, 10)
as a voluntary offering, although this was probably in connection with
the other sacrifices.   Also it was a special offering of Aaron and his
sons "in the day of their consecration" (Lev. vi. 20–23 [13–16]) in con-
nection with their other offerings.   Further, an offering of the first
fruits of vegetable products was allowed (Lev. ii. 12–16; vi. 14–18 [7, 8]),
but in so far as this was "the first fruits of the harvest" it was to be
accompanied with a lamb for a burnt offering (Lev. xxiii. 10–12, 17, 18).
The sin offering of fine flour of the very poor (Lev. v. 20–13) is expressly
distinguished from the מִנְחָה.

We regard these divergences, on the contrary, as intentional and designed to show the people, familiar with the Mosaic law, that his vision was to be understood ideally and not literally.

There is another point in connection with this daily offering. According to the law (Num. xxviii. 3–5) with each of the lambs, morning and evening, a meat and drink offering was to be made of 1-10 of an ephah of flour, $\frac{1}{4}$ of a hin of oil, and $\frac{1}{4}$ of a hin of strong wine. As Ezekiel speaks of but one offering he increases the accompanying meat offering to 1-6 of an ephah of flour, and to $\frac{1}{3}$ of a hin of oil. This is the same sort of change as in the case of the priests' marriage and mourning: the omitted provision is compensated for by an increase in what remains. And in this case also, the omitted provision having been certainly customary before the time of Ezekiel, this compensation has a manifest reference to the familiar, and therefore previously existing provisions of the Mosaic law.

An objection may be here interposed that the non-observance of the detail of Ezekiel's ritual in the subsequent ages is no more surprising than the corresponding non-observance of many particulars in the detail of the Mosaic ritual, which is very evident in the time of the Judges and the early monarchy. There is really no parallel between the two cases. The times of the Judges and of the early monarchy were a period of disorder and anarchy, in which the general confusion of society forbids the inference that such laws did not exist; but the times after Ezekiel were times of over-scrupulous and even superstitious observance of the minutest details of ritual, when it is inconceivable that his scheme should have been neglected through mere inadvertence and carelessness.

The ritual of the great feasts is considerably changed. Pentecost and the Day of Atonement are entirely omitted. In regard to the comparative value of these omissions in the historical books and in Ezekiel, the same thing is to be said as before: the omission in the former may have been merely accidental, and proves nothing; in Ezekiel it must have been intentional. It will appear presently, however, that while omitting the Day of Atonement from his scheme, he does probably allude to it in a way that shows familiarity with its observance. There remain to be considered the Passover, the feast of Tabernacles, and the "New Moons."

The Passover, according to Ezek. xlv. 21–23, is to be kept at the same time and for the same number of days, as in the Mosaic law, but there is no mention of the Paschal lamb itself; the sin-offering by the Mosaic law (Num. xxviii. 17, 22) was to be a he-goat for each day, here (vs. 23) a bullock for the first day and a he-goat for each of

the other days; the burnt offering for each day by the law was to be two bullocks, a ram and seven yearling lambs, here seven bullocks and seven rams; the meat offering by the law was to be 3-10 of a ephah of meal mixed with oil for each bullock, 2-10 for each ram, and 1-10 for each lamb, or in all 1½ ephahs daily—here a whole ephah for each victim, or in all 14 ephahs daily and as many hins of oil (vs. 24). The offerings in Ezekiel therefore are richer than those required by the law. The same thing is to be said of the special sacrifices for the Sabbaths. According to the law (Num. xxviii. 9) these were to be marked by two lambs for burnt offerings, each with the usual meat and drink offering; but according to this vision (xlvi. 4–5) the Sabbath burnt offering was to be six lambs and a ram, with an ephah for a meat offering with the ram, and that for the lambs dependent upon the ability and generosity of the prince, and in all cases a hin of oil to each ephah. (Nothing is said of the drink offering.) It is difficult to assign reasons for these details. They plainly do not agree with the Mosaic law, and it is well known that the custom of later ages was founded upon that law. We have no data in history before the exile to determine the custom in these details one way or the other; but the presumption is that here as elsewhere the prophet has intentionally varied from the known law and custom in order to mark the ideal character of his vision. Certainly this is no beginning or early stage in a developing *cultus;* for otherwise, in these details, which could as well be arranged one way as another, the authority of the prophet would have been followed; but there never was any attempt even, so far as historw shows, to realize his ideal.

The feast of Tabernacles, which has no name given to it in Ezekiel, but is simply a feast of seven days in the seventh month (xlv. 25), is greatly simplified. Here the sacrifices are to be the same as in the case of the Passover,—an entire change from the elaborate ritual of the Mosaic law (Num. xxix. 12–24)—with, on the whole, a great diminution in the number of victims and an omission of the extra eighth day added to the feast in Lev. (xxiii. 36, 39) and Num. (xxix. 35), and which in the law was expressly characterized as an addition,— sometimes included and sometimes not in the mention of the feast. In regard to these changes the same remarks are to be made as in the case of the Passover, with only this addition, that it appears from both 1 Kings viii. 65, 66 and 2 Chron. vii. 8–10 that this eighth day was always looked upon in the same way—as a part, and yet not a part, of the feast. Solomon keeps the feast to that day inclusive,

and then he makes a solemn assembly, and yet on that day dismisses the people to their homes.*

In regard to the New Moons, or the first day of every month, the Mosaic law prescribes (in addition to the burnt and meat offerings) a he-goat for a sin offering (Num. xxviii. 15).   In Ezekiel's scheme of the feasts, these new moons are entirely omitted, except for the first month, though afterwards incidentally alluded to.   The Mosaic law also provided on the tenth of the seventh month for a day of atonement, with special and very peculiar sacrifices (Lev. xvi.).   All this is condensed, as it were, in this vision, into two sacrifices, each of a young bullock, one upon the first and one upon the seventh day of the first month, with particulars in regard to them (to be mentioned presently) which seem to refer to the day of Atonement.   Now, it is certain from the history of David (1 Sam. xx. 5, 18, 24) and from other historical records (2 Kings iv. 23; 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4; viii. 13; xxxi. 3), as well as from allusions in the pre-exilic prophets (Isa. i. 13, 14; [lxvi. 23; Ps. lxxxi. 3]; Hos. ii. 11; Amos viii. 5) that the new moons were kept as sacred feasts in the ages before the exile, as it is known that they were also afterwards (Ezra iii. 5; Neh. x. 33).   The omission of these new moons from this description of the feasts is particularly instructive, because Ezekiel himself, in other parts of the vision (xliv. 17; xlvi. 3), incidentally, but repeatedly, mentions the "new moons" (in the plural) as days to be sanctified by special sacrifices, and requires the prince to provide the same offerings for them as for the Sabbath (xlvi. 6).† He thus shows that he was familiar with them and expects them to be continued, but in this setting forth of the cycle of the feasts he does not mention them.   This cannot be taken then for a part of the development of a priestly law.

He differs from the Mosaic law also in the ritual of the blood of these sacifices on the first and seventh days of the first month.   The Levitical law gives no directions for the blood of the offerings on the first day of the month, doubtless because it followed the ordinary rule and was simply sprinkled on the side of the altar; but it required

---

* The inconsistency which Kuenen (*Relig. of Isr.* Note II. on chap. viii. vol. ii. p. 296, 7) thinks he finds between the passages above cited is wholly imaginary.   Solomon observed seven days for the dedication of the altar in imitation of Lev. viii.–x., and then kept the feast for seven days after the altar had been consecrated.   Hence 1 Kings viii. 65 speaks of "seven days and seven days, even for fourteen days," and then of the following "eighth day"; while 2 Chron. viii. 9 explains more fully "they kept the dedication of the altar seven days and the feast seven days."

† The word is, in this last case, in the singular, as is also the Sabbath; but both are evidently used collectively.

the blood on the day of Atonement to be brought within the Holy of Holies and sprinkled before and upon the mercy seat. Ezekiel again compromises and directs that the blood of the sin offering on the first and seventh days of the first month shall be put "upon the posts of the house, and upon the four corners of the settle of the altar, and upon the posts of the gate of the inner court." There may be here a reminiscence of the day of Atonement, but nothing like a generic law which could have been specialized into the particular observances of the Mosaic law.   It is rather a purely ideal ritual, which nobody ever thought of reducing to practice. There is no such congruity between it and the Levitical regulations as a development hypothesis would require.

We may now consider, in a few words, the general cycle of the feasts.   As is well known, the Mosaic law prescribes three great feasts, that of the Passover for seven days, preceded by the putting away of leaven and the killing of the Paschal lamb; that of "weeks" or Pentecost, lasting only one day; and that of Tabernacles, lasting seven days, and with an eighth special day added; these three great annual festivals are all expressly recognized in Deuteronomy (xvi. 1–16), which is held by all to be pre-exilic.   Besides these, the first day of every month, the weekly Sabbath, and the day of atonement were to be kept holy and marked by special sacrifices.   The observance of nearly all of these is recognized in the historic and the older prophetical books.   The cycle of Ezekiel's vision is very different. He omits the feast of weeks, the Day of Atonement, and the new moons (except that of the first month,) and inserts a new feast on the seventh day of the same month.   This last, in connection with that on the first day of that month, he seems to intend as a compensation for the missing Day of Atonement; for he describes the sacrifices of the two (xlv. 20) as "for every one that erreth, and for him that is simple: so shall ye reconcile the house."   If this interpretation is correct, we have here an incidental recognition of the older observance of the Day of Atonement, although it is not mentioned.   But however this may be, Ezekiel's cycle of feasts accords neither with what went before nor with what followed after him.   Yet, as already said, it is plain from his incidental allusions to the New Moons that, in this point at least, he knew of the old order, and expected it to go on; and it is noticeable that the sacrifices prescribed for the New Moons (xlvi. 3–6) are not the same as the special sacrifices of the first month (xliv. 18–20).   Those were to be in each case "a young bullock" for a sin offering; these, six lambs and a ram for a burnt offering (xlvi. 4).   It is clear, therefore, that he did not intend this vision

to form the basis of an actual *cultus;* but knowing the old observances, expected them to continue.

Before leaving this part of the subject, it may be well to refer briefly to a few other places in which Ezekiel evidently recognizes the Mosaic law, although either altering or omitting its provisions.   In xlii, 13 he requires the priests to eat in the appropriate "holy chambers" "the meat offering, and the sin offering, and the trespass offering." He says nothing of the peace offerings, though he elsewhere repeatedly mentions them (xliii. 27; xlv. 15, 17; xlvi. 2, 12), nor does he anywhere give the ritual for them.   On the other hand, in the following verse (and also in xlvi. 18, 20) the prophet is more explicit than the law, requiring that "the priests'" garments wherein they minister "shall not be carried" out of the holy place into the outer court.   There is no such general direction in the Levitical law; but the same thing is required in certain special cases, and may therefore be thought to be implied in all (see Lev. vi. 10, 11).   Now, whatever theory is adopted concerning the relation of Ezekiel to the Mosiac law must equally explain this omission and this insertion.   The theory of the later development of the law does neither; for, in the one case, it would be a violent supposition that the ritual of the peace offerings and the directions about eating them were evolved from the prophet's silence, and in the other case, it would be very strange that in such a matter as the care of the priests' robes the later law should be the less definite.   But the hypothesis of the greater antiquity of the law explains both facts satisfactorily; Ezekiel had no occasion to repeat important provisions of the law with which both he and the people were familiar, but it was natural that in a matter of detail, he should express what was probably the common understanding of the law.

In xliii. 11 it is required that the priests' sin offering should be burned "in the appointed place of the house, without the Sanctuary."   This refers to a building "in the separate place" which is provided only in Ezekiel's vision (xli. 12-15; xlii. 1, 10, 13), and of which there is no trace either in the Pentateuch or in the temple of the restoration.   In such cases it was simply required in the law that the body of the victim should be burned "without the camp" (Lev. iv. 12, 13, 21; xvi. 27, &c.).   No doubt such a building as Ezekiel provided would have been a great convenience; but it was never erected.

The provision for large landed estates for the priests has already been mentioned; but in view of this the statement in xliv. 28, that the priests' office and perquisites "shall be unto them for an inherit-

ance: I am their inheritance: and ye shall give them no inheritance in Israel," can only be looked upon as a reminiscence of the expressions in the Mosaic law, without any nice regard to the other parts of the vision.

The provision for the Sabbatical year was distinctly pre-exilic, since it is given at length in Deut. xv.; yet there is no trace of its observance before the exile, and its non-observance is given by the Chronicler (2 Chron. xxxvi. 21) as the determining reason for the length of the captivity. We know that it was observed after the restoration (1 Macc. vi. 49; Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10, § 6; Tacitus, *Hist.* lib. v. 2, § 4). Here again is an important and characteristic institution, certainly forming part of the Hebrew legislation before the captivity, neglected until that period, and observed afterwards. Exodus (xxiii. 10, 11) and Leviticus (xxv. 2–7) contain the commands for it, but Ezekiel does not mention it. He certainly is not in this respect a bridge between Deuteronomy and Leviticus, between pre- and post-exilic legislation.

The omission of all mention of tithes in Ezekiel, a provision certainly in force from the earliest to the latest times, can only be accounted for on the supposition of its familiarity.

In the Mosaic law all the males of the people were required to present themselves at the sanctuary at the great annual festivals (Ex. xxiii. 14, 17; xxxiv. 23; Deut. xvi. 16); there is no such command in Ezekiel, doubtless because it was already entirely familiar. But in xlvi. 9, while speaking of the gate by which the prince shall enter, he incidentally recognizes the custom, "But when the people of the land shall come before the Lord in the solemn feasts," &c. He has made no provision for this, but recognizes it as a matter of course.

The omission in ch. xliii. is not only very striking in itself, but is of especial importance in its bearing upon the main question under discussion. In vs. 18–27 a detailed order is given for the seven days consecration of the newly erected altar, at once recalling the similar consecration of the altar in Lev. viii. But in that case the consecration was a double one,—of the altar and of the priests; here the priests are entirely omitted. Why? Evidently because the altar only was new and required to be consecrated; the priests had been consecrated of old.

But the question may be asked in regard to the changes of ritual, Why could there not have been deviations by the later priests from the scheme of Ezekiel, just as well as by Ezekiel from the laws of Moses? Simply because there is a good reason for them in one case and none at all in the other. If Ezekiel wished his description to be

understood ideally, it was important that he should introduce arbitrary variations from the recognized law and custom; but if he intended to set forth a scheme of actual future worship, there is no known reason why his successors should have deviated from it.

Passing now to what may be called the economic, or political features of the vision, there are only three points which call for especial attention, and even these but briefly; the provision for the cost of the sacrifices, the division of the land, and the regulations respecting the prince.

There is no distinct provision in the Mosaic law for defraying the cost of the general sacrifices, and we are told that this was still one of the many questions in dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees at a much later date. But it is fully and clearly settled in Ezekiel's vision. The cost is to be wholly borne by the prince (xliv. 17, 21–26; xlv. 4–7), who is to be provided with ample territorial possessions (xlv. 7, 8; xlviii. 20–22). As far as we have any record, this arrangement was quite new, and it was never followed out. It was, however, so wise and excellent a solution of the difficulty that we can only wonder at its never having been adopted, if any Israelite had ever looked upon this vision as a basis for theocratic legislation.

The division of the land has already been spoken of in connection with the evidence of the ideal character of this vision; but there are one or two other points which require mention. A striking feature of it is the ample provision here made for the prince with the proviso that it shall belong inalienably to him and his sons (xlvi. 17–18); for in connection with this assignment it is said (xlv. 18) "And my princes shall no more oppress my people," and again (xlvi. 18) "the prince shall not take of the people's inheritance by oppression." A vivid remembrance of the exactions and oppressions of former kings was evidently in the prophet's mind, and he provides a new and wise remedy. It was unfortunate for his people that they never thought of making this the basis for actual legislation, and so avoiding once for all the evils under which they continued to suffer.

Another very curious provision is that at the southern end of the "oblation" a strip of land is reserved, 5,000 by 25,000 reeds (xlviii. 15–19), in the midst of which is to be the city with its "suburbs" 5,000 reeds square. The remainder, *i. e.*, two pieces of land, each 5,000 by 10,000 reeds, is set apart that "the increase thereof shall be for food unto them that serve the city. And they that serve the city shall serve it out of all the tribes of Israel." It is quite unnecessary to point out the purely Utopian character of such an arrange-

ment in actual life; it is sufficient to call attention to the fact that
neither this nor any other of these economic regulations ever formed
a part of the Mosaic law, or were ever in any degree attempted to be
carried out.

The law of the tenure of the Levites' land is considerably changed
from that of the Mosaic legislation.   According to Lev. xxv. 32-34
the Levites might sell their houses and even their cities (only retain-
ing the right of redeeming them at any time, and their reversion in
the year of jubilee)—but they might not sell at all the fields of their
suburbs.   This last provision is here (xlviii. 15) extended to all
their landed property in the most emphatic way, and changes the
whole tenure of the Levitical land.   It is certain that it was never
carried into effect, for there never was any such territory assigned to
the Levites.   It is remarkable that nothing of this kind is mentioned
in connection with the priestly territory.

One other particular must be noticed in connection with the
division of the land.   Under the Mosaic law this was to be wholly par-
celled out among the tribes of Israel; and although frequent reference
is made to the "sojourning" of strangers among them, no provision is
made for allowing them any interest in the soil of the holy land.
Ezekiel, on the other hand, expressly commands (xlvii. 22, 23),
"Ye shall divide the land by lot for an inheritance unto you and the
strangers that sojourn among you, which shall beget children among
you; and they shall be unto you as born in the country among the
children of Israel; they shall have inheritance with you among the
tribes of Israel.   And it shall come to pass that in what tribe the
stranger sojourneth, there shall ye give him his inheritance."   Both
these provisions were adapted to their different times: in that of
Moses, the land was looked upon as the sole and peculiar possession
of the chosen people, and if strangers came among them it should
be as "sojourners" only; in the time of Ezekiel matters were greatly
changed, and large numbers of foreigners had long had their per-
manent residence among the tribes of Israel.   It is only for these
permanent residents "which shall beget children among you" that
Ezekiel provides.   It is very difficult to suppose that the Mosaic
legislation should have been subsequent to his arrangements.

But by far the most important laws of this vision in political mat-
ters are those concerning the relation of the prince to the temple
worship.   A brief mention of these will close this paper.   It is plain
that under the old theocracy the monarch had no properly ecclesiasti-
cal standing.   He had great influence of course, either like David in
advancing and improving the worship, or like Ahaz in corrupting and

injuring it. But he was not recognized at all in the laws of the Pentateuch except that, in Deut. xvii. 14–20, it is declared that, in case a king should be afterwards desired, his otherwise arbitrary power must be checked by various limitations. Quite in accordance with the supposition of the great antiquity of that legislation, it is found that the monarch never had any other than a purely political position. This obvious fact is certainly very remarkable if the Mosaic law was subsequent to the introduction of the monarchy; indeed it is almost inconceivable that the laws of a theocratic state, if written when there was a monarch upon the throne, and prescribing the duties of all other officers, should take no notice of the monarch himself. But the difficulty is still greater if it could be supposed that these laws were inaugurated or largely developed by Ezekiel who gives such a prominent place in his scheme "to the prince." It is certain that the arrangements here suggested were never carried out, even when such an excellent prince as Zerubbabel was the leader of the restoration. At a subsequent time the offices of prince and priest were indeed combined in the Maccabees, but this was in virtue of their priestly descent and ended with their family; it has nothing to do with the vision of Ezekiel who, while he makes the prince very prominent in his ecclesiastical system, yet assigns to him no priestly functions.

Let what Ezekiel says of "the prince" be carefully noted. His large landed estate, given expressly to prevent oppressive exactions from the people,* and to enable him to furnish all the victims and

---

*In this connection general provision is made (xlv. 10, 11) for just weights and measures among the people. No one can read the passage without observing a connection between it and Lev. xix. 36 and Deut. xxv. 13. The question of priority is indicated by the terms employed. The words used here and in various parts of the Pentateuch are: (1) *Ephah.* This occurs in all ages of Hebrew literature from Exodus to Zechariah. (2) *Homer*, in the sense of a measure, found in the law (3 times), in Isaiah and Hosea (each once), and in Ezekiel (7 times). (3) *Hin.* This is found only in the middle books (Ex.–Num.) of the Pentateuch (16 times) and in Ezekiel (6 times). (4) *Omer*, עֹמֶר, in the

sense of measure, in Exodus only (6 times). (5) *Gerah*, in the sense of a measure of value, only in Ex.–Num. (4 times) and in Ezekiel (once). (6) *Bath*, as a measure, does not occur earlier than Kings (twice), Chronicles (3 times), Isaiah (once), but in Ezekiel 7 times. (7) *Cor.* In Kings and Chronicles 7 times, in Ezekiel once. That is to say, all these terms which are used in the law, with the exception of *Omer*, are also used in Ezekiel, while *Hin* and *Gerah* appear to have gone out of use and are found afterwards only in this vision, and *Homer* only elsewhere once each in Isaiah and Hosea; on the other hand, *Bath* and *Cor*, which came into use at a comparatively late date, are not found in the law, but are used by Ezekiel.

other offerings for the national sacrifices, have already been men-
tioned.   Besides these things he is to take a very active and peculiar
part in the *cultus* of his people.   The east gate of the court of
the temple had been, according to this vision, peculiarly sancti-
fied by the entrance through it of the glory of the LORD (xliii.

It may not be amiss to give here a list of other words found only in the
Pentateuch and in Ezekiel: סוֹרֵשָׁה; בָּפַל; יְשִׁפֶה; אֹדֶם; סֶלַח; אָבִיב;
מִין, in the sense of *species*.   (Stebbins,—*A Study in the Pentateuch*,
p. 169,—has noticed that it occurs in this sense 30 times in the Penta-
teuch.); נֹפֶךְ; נֹגַהּ; נִיחוֹחַ; מִצְנֶפֶת; מָלָה; מִכְנָסַיִם; the word נֶפֶשׁ is a
very common one, occurring nearly 800 times, but in the sense of *lower
animals* it is found only in the Pentateuch (about 18 times) and in Ezek.
xlvii. 9 except once in Isaiah (xix. 10); מוּסַבּוֹת (Hoph. part from סָבַב);
עָגִיל; עֵירֹם (this occurs 4 times in the Pentateuch and 6 times in Eze-
kiel; but of the other words for *naked* only עָרוֹם is found once in the
Pentateuch and not at all in Ezekiel, though the more common word in
the later books); עֲלָטָה, a very peculiar word for darkness; עַרְמוֹן;
פֶּרַע; פֶּרֶךְ; פָּרוּחַ; פֶּטֶר (kal part. pass.); צֵאָה, a peculiar word for
which other derivatives of יָצָא are commonly used; צָוָה in the *Pual;*
קָרְבָּן; קָצַע; צֹר; צָמִיד; צִיצִת; צִחֹק (in the Pent. 56 times); קְרָשׁ (in the
Pent. 50 times); קַשְׂקֶשֶׂת (this occurs also in 1 Sam: xvii. 5 but in a dif-
ferent sense); רֹבֶן; רָזֶה; תַּהַשׁ; רָבִיד.   To these should be added such
words as occur elsewhere only in passages referring to the Pentateuch,
as; מְרִיבָה (3 times in the Ps.); שֶׁרֶץ (Ps. cv. 30).   There are also a
number of words found only once elsewhere, as: אָבְלָה, Pent. 7 times,
Ezek. 11 times and Jer. xii. 9; בְּתוּלִים (Judg. xi. 37, 38); מִמְכָּר (Neh.
xiii. 20); נַתַּח (Judg. xix. 29); פָּתִיל (Judg. xvi. 9); שִׁקֻּץ (Isa. lxvi. 17).
The usage of two different words for prince should be noted in this
connection: נָשִׂיא occurs 70 times in the Pentateuch, 13 times in
Joshua, 34 times in Ezekiel, and only 13 times in all the other books put
together; while the more general word for *prince*, נָגִיד (occurring in all
43 times) is used but once in Ezekiel and not at all in the Pentateuch.
Delitzsch has noted (Pref. to *The Lev. Priests*, p. xiii., xiv.) that the
word סַפִּיר, which occurs elsewhere, is used only in Ex. xxiv. 10; Ezek.
i. 26; x. 1 to indicate that blue of the heavens of which there is such
rare mention in all antiquity.   These instances must be considered
numerous enough to establish some connection between the Pentateuch
and Ezekiel,—they can hardly be quite independent of each other.   The
archaisms of the former and the aramaisms of the latter mark their
comparative antiquity.

1–7; xliv. 1, 2); in consequence it was to be forever after shut, except for the prince (xliv. 3). He was to enter and go out through it on the Sabbaths and the new moons (xlvi. 1–3), and was to worship at the threshold of this gate while the priests were offering his sacrifices, "the people of the land" meantime worshipping without "at the door of this gate." On these occasions the gate, although not to be used by any one else, is to stand open until the evening. In these cases, when few of the people were expected to be present, the prince seems to have been looked upon as their representative, and it was his duty to be always present and offer the required offerings. When the prince saw fit to offer any "voluntary burnt offering or peace offerings" the same gate was to be opened for him, but immediately shut when he had gone out (*ib.* 12). On occasion of the "solemn feasts," on the other hand, when the mass of the people were expected to be present, the prince was to take his place among them, and to enter "in the midst of them" by the north or south gate, and go out by the opposite one (*ib.* 9, 10).

There is also another provision which puts the prince in the same light of the religious representative of the people. To enable him to furnish the required sacrifices and oblations he is to have not only the large and inalienable landed estate already mentioned, but also is to receive from the whole people regularly a tax in kind of the things required for these purposes. This tax is prescribed in detail in xlv. 13–16, and was to consist of one sixtieth of the grain, one hundredth of the oil, and one two hundredth of the flock. The connection shows that it was to be used by him for supplying the offerings. This is an entire change from both the older and the later custom whereby the people gave directly to the sanctuary, and it again brings forward "the prince" as the representative and embodiment, as it were, of the people in their duties of public worship.

The argument from all this is clear and has already been hinted at. If Ezekiel thus presents the civil ruler as a representative of the people and an important factor in their temple worship, it is simply impossible that any actual legislation, influenced by his vision, should have so totally ignored "the prince" as is notoriously done in the Levitical laws. It would seem that even if the priests and the people had not insisted upon their sovereign's occupying his proper position in their worship, every pious prince would have claimed it for himself. The conclusion is obvious: the Levitical laws are older than Ezekiel, and his vision had no direct effect upon the polity of the Jewish people.

All the more important features of the vision of Ezekiel, so far as

his relation to the Mosaic law is concerned, have now been passed in
review.   Others, such as the detailed arrangements of his temple, with
its various peculiar outbuildings, and its large "precincts," &c.,
would require too much time to examine in detail, as I have else-
where done,* and would only add fresh illustrations of the fact which
has been everywhere apparent.   If we compare the customs of the
Jews as they are known after the exile with those which are known
to have existed before, they are found perfectly to agree in every-
thing, except negatively in so far as data are wanting to show in some
respects what were the customs of the more ancient time.   This de-
ficiency was of course to be expected in dealing with matters of such
antiquity, where the records we have are almost wholly occupied with
other matters.   Moreover, both the ancient custom as far as it was
regulated by law and can be traced, (making allowance for some small
difficulties in understanding such very ancient legislation), and the later
practice perfectly agree with the Mosaic legislation.   But quite late in
the history of Israel, during the captivity in Babylon, the prophet Eze-
kiel comes forward and in a remarkable vision sets forth a general
scheme of theocratic laws and worship.   His scheme presents incident-
ally many obvious allusions to the Levitical laws, but in its direct en-
actments is quite at variance with both former and later custom and
also with the Mosaic law.   It is in no sense, and in no point on the line
of development from what existed before to what existed afterwards.
Yet we are asked to believe that the Levitical law only existed in a very
imperfect and inchoate form before him, that he gave the great im-
petus to its development, and that within 40 years afterwards the
nearly perfect scheme was accepted as their ancient law by his nation.
The thing required is beyond our power.

---

*Com. on Ezekiel in Bp. Ellicott's commentary for English readers.

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

Proceedings in June, 1881.

The Society met according to appointment in the Library of the Yale Divinity School, June 2d, 1881, at 2½ P. M.

Present : Profs. Abbot, Beecher, Briggs, Brown, Day, Dwight, Gardiner, Goodwin, Gould, Mitchell, Prentice, Rich, Toy, the Rev. H. Ferguson, Rev. Drs. Harwood and Ward, and subsequently, Prof. George P. Fisher, D. D.

The President having taken the chair, the minutes of the last meeting were read, corrected and approved.

Letters were read from several absent members expressing their regret at their inability to be present, and giving reasons therefor.

Prof. Smith of the Lane Theological Seminary was introduced by Dr. Briggs, and was invited to attend the sessions of the Society.

Several papers printed in the Journal were read and discussed as far as the time allowed, the following business being transacted in the intervals.

Voted: That the final adjournment of this meeting be at 1 P. M. on Friday.

Prof. Dwight invited the Society to meet some gentlemen of New Haven at his house at 8.30 P. M.

The Society expressed their thanks to Prof. Dwight and voted to accept his invitation.

Voted: To take a recess from 6 to 7 P. M.

Voted: That Prof. Abbot be requested to furnish a copy of his paper for publication in full in the proceedings.

Voted: That the matter of issuing a volume of transactions, and the whole subject of printing the papers in general be referred to the council.

The election of officers and the transaction of the general business of the Society was made the order of the day for 7 P. M.

On reassembling after the recess, the council recommended Prof. George P. Fisher, D. D. for membership, and he was unanimously elected.

A committee consisting of Profs. Toy and Brown and Rev. H. Ferguson was appointed on the nomination of officers. This committee subsequently reported the following nominations and the persons so nominated were elected:

Rev. D. R. Goodwin, D. D., LL. D., - - -	*President.*
Rev. James Strong, D. D., - - -	*Vice President.*
Rev. F. Gardiner, D. D., - - - -	*Secretary.*
Rev. C. A. Briggs, D. D., - - - -	*Treasurer.*
Rev. Ezra Abbot, D. D., LL. D.,	
Rev. George E. Day, D. D.,	*Additional Members*
Rev. Timothy Dwight, D. D.,	
Prof. Charles Short, LL. D.,	*of the Council.*
Rev. C. M. Mead, Ph. D.,	

The Treasurer presented his report, which was referred to an auditing committee consisting of Drs. Day and Dwight. This committee subsequently reported that "they had compared the vouchers of the Treasurer with the receipts and find them to correspond; and also that the records of receipts and expenditures agree with the summing of the whole as given in the Treasurer's report."

(Signed)   George E. Day.

The report was accepted and ordered placed on file.

The Society adjourned to 9 A. M. on Friday, and reassembled at that hour.

On the recommendation of the Council, accompanied by statements in regard to their publications, the following persons were unanimously elected to membership.

Rev. John E. Todd, D. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. Howard Osgood, D. D.,	Rochester, New York.
Rev. Bernard Pick, Ph. D.	Rochester, New York.

The Council appointed the Union Theological Seminary in New York as the place for the next meeting, at such day and hour during the Christmas holidays as may be determined by a committee consisting of Drs. Briggs, Crosby and Short.

A tribute was paid to the memory of our deceased colleague, the Rev. E. A. Washburn, D. D., by the Rev. Dr. Harwood. After

further remarks by other members, a committee, consisting of Drs. Harwood, Goodwin, and Abbot, was appointed to prepare a minute in relation to the deceased, to be entered in our printed proceedings. This committee prepared the following minute:

It has pleased Almighty God, in His wise providence, to remove from the membership of this Society our brother, the late Edward A. Washburn, Doctor in Divinity. In his death the Church and the community have met with a serious loss. Dr. Washburn was keenly interested in the formation and in the purposes and work of this Society: for he saw that one of the weaknesses and evils of the Church of this present day is the wide spread ignorance of the Sacred Scriptures among even the commissioned preachers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Hence he hailed every movement for the intellectual enlightenment of the clergy with chivalrous ardor and a generous hospitality. This inspired him with zeal in the department of sacred criticism and philology, while he served none the less the cause of dogmatic theology when and where all interest in it seemed threatened with lethargy, if not with extinction. Dr. Washburn's personal sympathies, his bright intelligence, his brave support of every movement for the increase of the knowledge of the faith that is in Christ, made him a valued and valuable member of every society of Christian men with which he was associated, and we, in common with many others, deeply deplore his loss and regret his death in the fullness of his hopes and powers.

Respectfully submitted,

Edwin Harwood,

In behalf of a Special Committee.

The questions on the admissibility of papers opposing the conclusions of papers previously read, and of limiting the length of discussions, were considered and a general understanding on both subjects was reached.

Voted: That the thanks of the Society be returned to the New Haven committee of arrangements for the use of the room, and for their provision for the comfort of the members.

After the reading of the rough minutes, the Society adjourned.

Frederic Gardiner,

Secretary.

Proceedings in December, 1881.

———•———

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis met in the Chapel of the Union Theological Seminary, 9 University Place, New York, according to appointment, at 10 A. M., Dec. 29th, 1881.

There were present Profs. E. Abbot, C. A. Briggs, Francis Brown, H. A. Buttz, Rev. T. W. Chambers, Pres. Thomas Chase, Profs. Geo. E. Day, F. Gardiner, D. R. Goodwin, I. H. Hall, Rev. R. D. Hitchcock, Profs. C. M. Mead, H. G. T. Mitchell, Howard Osgood, John A. Paine, P. Schaff, Charles Short, James Strong, and Henry R. Weston.

The chair was taken at the opening by the Vice-President.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The Council in the course of the meeting recommended the following persons, and they were thereupon duly elected as members of the Society:

Prof. C. I. H. Ropes,	Bangor, Maine.
Prof. R. D. Hitchcock, D. D.,	9 University Place, New York.
Rev. S. M. Jackson,	42 Bible House, New York.
Prof. Geo. McI. Du Bois,	Cor. Walnut and 39th Sts., Philadelphia.
Prof. J. T. Beckwith, Ph. D.,	Hartford, Conn.
Rev. Canon Maurice Baldwin,	Montreal, Canada.
Prof. Samuel Hart,	Hartford, Conn.
Rev. E. W. Rice,	1122 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.
Prof. H. P. Smith,	Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati.
Prof. L. I. Evans, D. D.,	Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati.
Prof. S. Ives Curtiss, Ph. D.,	364 W. Washington St., Chicago.

Various letters from absent members were read.

The President arrived and took the chair.

The first paper, "Remarks on Rom. ix. 5," was read by Prof. E. Abbot at 10:45 A. M., and was discussed until 1 P. M., when a recess was taken until 2:30 P. M.

After the recess, some time was occupied in the election of the members recommended by the Council.

At 2:55 P. M. the second paper was read by Prof. D. R. Goodwin, "On the use of ψυχή, πνεῦμα and connected words in the sacred writings." (This paper is printed at the beginning of the Journal for December, as being a part of the last paper at the June meeting.) This paper was discussed until 4:05 P. M.

After discussion it was voted: that papers whose authors are not present shall go to the foot of the list; and that in case the authors are not heard from for two consecutive meetings, the Secretary shall enquire if they wish to have their papers continued.

A statement was made by the Treasurer.

Voted: that the Secretary be requested to enquire of those who have not paid their initiation fee or their assessments for two years whether they wish to be considered members of the Society.

At 4:17 the next paper was read by Prof. C. M. Mead, "An Examination of Ex. xxxiii. 7–11," and was discussed until 5:25.

At 5:25 the fourth paper was read by Rev. Dr. Chambers, "On Everlasting Father in Isa. ix. 6, 7," and was discussed until the recess.

At 5:50 the Society took a recess until 7:30.

On reassembling after the recess the Council announced the place and time of the next meeting as New Haven during the first week of June, the day, hour and place to be fixed by a committee consisting of Drs. Day, Dwight and Harwood.

At 7:40 the last paper was read by Prof. F. Gardiner, "On Ezekiel in relation to the Levitical law," and was discussed until 9:40.

The rough minutes of the meeting were then read, and the Society adjourned.

FREDERIC GARDINER, Secretary.

The following papers were not read and stand over to the next meeting:

On the Syriac Apocalypse. By Prof. I. H. Hall, Ph. D.

On the interpretation of Gen. xlix. 10. By President S. C. Bartlett, D. D.

An exegesis of the reference to the potter and the clay in Rom. ix. 21. By Chancellor Howard Crosby, LL. D.

A critical examination of 1 Tim. iv. 1–5. By Rev. E. R. Craven, D. D.

A neglected argument for the Apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel. By Prof. Geo. Prentice, D. D.

On ברא in Josh xvii. 15, 18, and Ezek. xxi. 24; xxiii. 47. By Willis J. Beecher, D. D.

On the Hebrew tenses in conditional clauses.   By Rev. H. Ferguson.

On Job xix. 26.   By Rev. J. I. Mombert, D. D.

Notes on the book of Tobit.   By Prof. C. H. Toy, D. D.

On discoveries in Palestine.   By Prof. Selah Merrill, D. D.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

Prof. Ezra Abbot, D.D., LL.D., 23 Berkeley St., Cambridge, Mass.

Rev. Canon Maurice Baldwin, Montreal, Canada.

President S. C. Bartlett, D. D., Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

Prof. J. T. Beckwith, Ph. D.,   Hartford, Conn.

Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.,   Auburn, N. Y.

Prof. John Binney,   Middletown, Conn.

Prof. C. A. Briggs, D. D.,   Union Theol. Seminary, New York.

Prof. Francis Brown,   9 University Place, New York.

* Rev. J. K. Burr, D. D.,   Trenton, N. J.

Prof. J. H. Buttz, D. D.,   Madison, N. J.

President W. C. Cattell, D. D.,   Lafayette College, Easton, Penn.

Rev. T. W. Chambers, D. D.,   70 West 36th St., New York.

President Thos. Chase, LL. D.,   Haverford Col., Delaware Co., Penn.

Prof. T. J. Conant, D. D.,   Brooklyn, N. Y.

Chan'r Howard Crosby, LL. D., 116 East 19th St., New York.

Rev. Elijah R. Craven, D. D.,   Newark, N. J.

Prof. S. Ives Curtiss, Ph. D.,   364 West Washington St., Chicago, Ill.

Prof. George E. Day, D. D.,   New Haven, Conn.

Prof. John De Witt, D. D.,   Theol. Sem. of Ref'd Dutch Church,
                             New Brunswick, N. J.

Prof. Timothy Dwight, D. D.,   New Haven, Conn.

Prof. Geo. McI. Du Bois,   Cor. Walnut and 39th Sts., Philadelphia.

Prof. L. I. Evans, D. D.,   Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rev. Henry Ferguson,   Claremont, N. H.

Prof. Geo. P. Fisher, D. D.,   New Haven, Conn.

Prof. F. Gardiner, D. D.,   Middletown, Conn.

Prof. D. R. Goodwin, D. D., LL. D., 3927 Locust St., Philadelphia.

Prof. E. P. Gould,   Newton Theol. Sem., Newton, Mass.

Prof. Isaac H. Hall, Ph. D.,   Office of *S. S. Times*, Philadelphia.

Prof. Samuel Hart,   Hartford, Conn.

Prof. C. D. Hartranft, D. D.,   Hartford, Conn. (Box 524)

* Died in April, 1882.

Rev. E. Harwood, D. D.,   New Haven, Conn.
Prof. R. D. Hitchcock, D. D.,   9 University Place, New York.
Rev. S. M. Jackson,   42 Bible House, New York.
Prov't C. P. Krauth, LL. D.,   Univ. of Pa., Philadelphia.
Prof. C. M. Mead, Ph. D.,   Andover, Mass.
Prof. Selah Merrill, D. D.,   Andover, Mass.
Prof. H. G. T. Mitchell, Ph. D., Middletown, Conn.
Rev. J. I. Mombert, D. D.,   Passaic, N. J.
Prof. Howard Osgood, D. D.,   Rochester, New York.
Prof. John A. Paine, Ph. D.,   Tarrytown, N. Y.
Rev. Bernard Pick, Ph. D.,   Rochester, N. Y.
Prof. George Prentice, D. D.,   Middletown, Conn.
Rev. E. W. Rice,   1122 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.
Prof. Thomas H. Rich,   Bates College, Lewiston, Me.
Prof. M. B. Riddle,   Hartford, Conn.
Prof. C. I. H. Ropes,   Bangor, Me.
Prof. P. Schaff, D. D.,   42 Bible House, New York.
Prof. Charles Short, LL. D.,   24 West 60th St., New York.
Prof. H. P. Smith,   Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Prof. P. H. Steenstra,   Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. James Strong, D. D.,   Madison, N. J.
Prof. J. H. Thayer, D. D.,   Andover, Mass.
Rev. John E. Todd, D. D.,   New Haven, Conn.
Prof. C. H. Toy, D. D.,   Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, D. D.,   37 East 35th St., New York.
Rev. W. H. Ward, D. D.,   Office of *Independent*, New York.
Prof. Henry R. Weston, D. D.,   Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Penn.

ERRATA.

Page 3, note, line 8 from bottom, *for* Oldshausen *read* Olshausen

" 17, No. 6, line 2, *for* θεοῦ, τὸν *read* θεοῦ . . . τὸν.

" 34, l. 4, for *fur* read *für*, and for 1868–9 read 1869.

" 37, line 8, *for* Septugaint *read* Septuagint.

" 75, line 3 from bottom, and p. 79, line 3 from bottom, *substitute* ם *for* ט

" 89, No. 4, line 2, *for* is *read* Is

" 103, note *, *add at the end*, 1 Macc. x. 69, τὸν ὄντα ἐπὶ κοίλης Συρίας.

" 112, line 2, *for* objectionable *read* unobjectionable

" 113, No. 2, line 2, *for* 9 *read* 6

" 123, note *, last line, *for* Cap. *read* Chap.

" 127, line 8, from bottom of text, place " *after* Christ

" 134, line 7, *for* Christian writers *read* ancient Christian writers

" " " 22, *for* Cardinal Newman *read* Dr. J. H. Newman

" " " 24, *after* Pseudo-Cæsarius *add* and Methodius as Pseudo-Methodius

" 139, 4th paragraph, last line, *for* p. 126 *read* p. 126, note †.

" 140, 2d paragraph, line 5, *dele* Amphilochius. (See p. 137.)

" 143, 2d paragraph, line 8, for *chirstl.* read *christl.*

" 144, l. 21, for *Sunde* read *Sünde.*

" 146, l. 9, *for* Herrüber *read* Herr über

" " last line, *after* N. T. *add* (1832)

" 147, last line, for *Briefs* read *Briefes.*

Minor errors, e. g. in the Greek accents and breathings, the scholar will readily correct for himself.

Table of Contents.

----◆----

Journal of the Society

OF

Biblical Literature and Exegesis,

INCLUDING MOST OF THE

PAPERS READ AND ABSTRACT OF PROCEEDINGS,

FOR

JUNE AND DECEMBER, 1882.

———•———

The Society prints the papers read in full, but is not respon-sible for any opinions expressed therein.

•———•———

Notes on the Beirût Syriac Codex.

BY PROF. ISAAC H. HALL, PH. D.

I. *History and External Description.*

Some months after the discovery of this MS., or rather, of the character of its contents, I published a hasty account in *The* (London) *Academy*, 2d vol. of 1877, p. 170, and in *The Independent* (New York), August 23, 1877; and later, a rather more extended summary in the *Proceedings* of the American Oriental Society for October, 1877, pp. xvi. ff. As all these accounts contain a few errors, partly of oversight, partly inevitable, it will not be out of place to begin from the beginning, although that course involves some repetition.

The codex I found in the library of the Syrian Protestant College at Beirût, kept as an unknown curiosity, and kept no more carefully than the other books there. No one there had skill to read it, except perhaps Dr. Van Dyck, and he was not aware of its existence, much less of its presence in the library. As the manuscript had suffered from some former exposure to water, and was still suffering from incipient renewed decay, I took measures for its more careful keeping, and at the same time proceeded to read and examine it. When Dr. Bliss, the president of the college, returned in the autumn of 1876 from a two years' stay in England and America, he informed me that it had been brought from Mardîn by one 'Abd ul-Messiah (not the man of the same name who accompanied the explorer Layard), who had been employed as superintendent of the native workmen in the erection of the main college building; and that he (Dr. Bliss) had induced him to present it to the college.

Proceeding with my examination, I found that the Gospels were evidently of the Philoxenian or Harklensian version, though I had of that version at that time only the specimens in Bernstein's Kirsch's *Chrestomathy* (Lips., Knobloch, 1832), and Tychsen's *Elementare*

Syriacum (Rostoch, 1793.)   The rest of the codex was the Peshitto.
From its state, material, and style of writing, I judged it to belong
to a period limited by the eighth and tenth centuries.   But wishing
to have a more competent judgment, I mailed six loose leaves* to
Dr. Antonio M. Ceriani, the well-known critic at the Ambrosian Li-
brary at Milan, to whom I was already indebted for valuable favors,
and requested his opinion.   He soon replied, saying, "immediately
I saw the fragments are part of a New Testament of about the IX.
century, of Jacobite origin."   Some days later he returned the leaves
with a longer comment.   A quire signature on one of the leaves had
enabled him to compute very closely the size of the manuscript, with
a number of interesting particulars beside.   He concluded with the
remark: "Omnino inspiciendum si habet Apocalypsim, quia fortasse
esset antiquissimus omnium codicum pro hoc libro.   Contuli folium
tertium [third of the one I sent, No. 128 of the codex as it is] cum
edita Harklensi translatione, et lectionibus variis in vetustissimis
libris; textus in summa melior est illo editionis White."

The codex at present, or as found, consists of 203 leaves of pretty
fine parchment, though the fineness is not uniform; two of them
mere fragments.   The size of the leaf is 10½ x 7½ inches in length
and breadth; the writing in two columns to a page, each column 7½
inches high by 2 to 2¼ inches wide, and regularly 32 lines to a
column.   Very rarely the lines in a column number 31 or 33.   The
margin or space between the columns is about half an inch wide, so
that the whole written portion of the page is generally 7½ x 5 inches
in height and width.   The codex is made up of *quiniones*, that is, in
quires of five folios, or ten leaves, each; each *quinio* numbered on
the middle of the lower margin, at beginning and end, after the com-
mon fashion of Syriac MSS.   From the general appearance of the
codex, and other obvious reasons, I conclude that it originally con-
sisted of 24 *quiniones*, and contained the books which compose the
ordinary Peshitto version; that is, all the New Testament except the
second and third Epistles of John, the second Epistle of Peter, Jude,
and the Apocalypse.

In its present state the codex begins in its original *quinio* 2, in
Matthew xii. 20; and ends in its original *quinio* 24, in Titus i. 9.
The order of the books is the following: the Gospels in the usual
order; then Acts, James, 1 Peter, 1 John; then the Epistles of Paul

* These leaves were numbers 1, 62, 98, 128, 202, 203, of the codex in
its present condition.

in the usual order, without the Epistle to the Hebrews; which last doubtless came at the end and completed the codex. Except two long omissions, and in places where a leaf is gone, the *lacunæ* are inconsiderable. The missing leaves, besides those gone from the beginning and end, are usually those at the beginning or end of a *quinio*, or both; as the outer folio would soonest wear through at the back. The first leaf is a mere fragment, containing portions from Matt. xii. 20–48. The *lacunæ* of one leaf or more are the following: Matt. xiii. 28–57, one leaf; xvii. 20—xix. 12, one leaf; xxv. 11 —xxvi. 31, one leaf; Mark iv. 2–35, one leaf; Luke xix. 38—xx. 21, one leaf; John viii. 31 (20 of Syriac numbering)—ix. 31, two leaves; 2 Corinthians xiii. 8—Galatians ii. 17, two leaves; Philippians ii. 15 —Colossians i. 8, two leaves; 1 Timothy iii. 3—2 Timothy iii. 5 (except that a fragment preserves a few words in 1 Timothy ii. 10– 19; iii. 1–3), two leaves and a large fragment.

The other two important *lacunæ* by omission are 2 Corinthians x. 1–14, and Galatians iii. 15–29. In addition to these defects, the passage Acts xi. 2–19 is transposed with the next one, Acts xi. 19–39. In this case the scribe copied one church-lesson out of its order by mistake, and supplied the defect as soon as he came to the end of the lesson first written. He also marked the place by leaving a space of four lines, and writing the vermilion lesson-note therein more conspicuously than usual. The other two defects mentioned had an origin nearly similar. That in Galatians omits a church-lesson, giving its rubricated title, but skipping over to the matter of the following lesson, and omitting the title to the latter.

An easy computation shows that the end of the twenty-fourth *quinio* would have just included the whole of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with part of a page for subscription and colophon. The Apocalypse would have required two *quiniones* in addition to that; and I cannot believe that so much could ever have been removed without leaving the evidence on the binding at the back. It seems beyond a doubt that the Apocalypse was never there. It should be stated here that not every *quinio* was originally full. *Quinio* 5 never contained but 9 leaves, and *quinio* 16 only 8.

A word is proper here with regard to the deciphering. The age of the codex alone would cause some difficulties; but time alone, apart from other agencies, has dealt tenderly with its legibility, though it shows its work abundantly upon the firmness of the material. But at some time or other the upper portion of the codex had been soaked in water, so that nearly throughout the whole manu-

script the upper half of each page is difficult to read, requiring the greatest patience and a skillful use of light.   Sometimes a word requires hours to make it out.   In damp weather some portions are illegible which can be read when it is dry.   For this reason much of the codex is easy to read in this country, which could not be read in winter at Beirût.   Sometimes writing set off on an opposite page helps the decipherment; at other times it hinders it.   Sometimes the ink is entirely gone, but has left the letter etched into the surface. In many places the writing is hygroscopic, and becomes plain for a few seconds when the surface is dampened; in such cases appearing either instantly or after the lapse of half a minute to a minute.   In other places a roughened surface conceals the ink which has penetrated to the interior of the membrane, and shows the writing when the surface is rendered transparent by moisture.   But the artifices of deciphering are numerous, and perhaps as tedious in the full recital as the work itself has been.   It needs only to be added that every letter, and most of the vowels and points, of the text are decipherable.   A few of the section-numbers which belong in the margin I cannot find.   They may have faded out, or they may never have been written.   Sad work has been often made with the rubricated portions, which wash away readily with water; but, after all, most of them are decipherable.   The vermilion title to Timothy is almost the only important one that has been wholly obliterated.

After the soaking in water mentioned above, which made so many holes, and took off a number of upper outer corners by decay, a very late second hand has re-written a few spots, and re-inked a few vowels, besides adding here and there a new vowel not in the first writing.   But the aggregate of such re-writings is insignificant, and nowhere interferes with the deciphering of the first hand.   This second hand writing is of the more recent Jacobite style, but doubtless a century old, at least.   To a similar period belong a few scrawls on the margins, made by some unthinking idler.

But, still later, the codex had some usage that may have been even rougher.   It was this time soaked in *muddy* water; and when I found the codex there was so much absolute mud—earth and water—within it, caked on the leaves, that *quinio* 22 could not be read at all without first a scaling off and then a washing.   (But in the six years since that process its writing has come out plainer than in most other portions of the codex, though the parchment shows a yellower color.) To this day some caked mud remains in minute spots, for I have not ventured to wash except where absolutely necessary in order to

read it.   Indeed, in order to decipher it, the whole codex had to be taken apart; and the mass of rotten cord and cloth and mud, which represented the remnant of the ancient binding, had to be removed. Mixed in with the latter were sundry grains of wheat and barley — as if the book had stood cornerwise in the mud of a grain bazar.   This rotten back was washed out, and proved to be a curious fabric of twine and cloth, wrought by the binder's needle.   It would have been preserved; only the moths and roaches of the East soon put it beyond hope.

In addition to all that, the damp climate of Beirût — rain in winter and the sea in summer — had started the decay anew along the edges, especially where the former visitation of water had left it ragged.   And as if that were not enough, a great fat moth, one of the very juicy kind common in Beirût, had been squeezed between two leaves as the MS. stood in the library, leaving the impression of his wings to this day, along with a fearful decay of membrane over nearly the whole of two pages, seriously damaging the substance of the parchment itself.   I was kindly permitted — indeed the suggestion came from Dr. Bliss — to bring the MS. to America, in order to finish my work with it.   It had to be watched and kept from damp on the sea voyage, or the old spots would show dissolving edges. The climate of this country is more favorable to both its legibility and its preservation, than the climate of Beirût.

II. *Internal Description.*

As to the style of the writing, it is of the transition from Estrangela to Jacobite, but not yet progressed so far as to have lost entirely a resemblance to the old Nestorian.   The pure Estrangela style and letters are perhaps more conspicuous in the Gospel of Mark than elsewhere, but they occur throughout the whole codex.   The Jacobite style which it resembles nearest, is altogether the Mesopotamian, not at all approaching the Palestinian or the Maronite.   It is easy to read to one who is familiar with the Estrangela; but not very easy for one who knows only the common Jacobite of the printed books. It is pretty well supplied with diacritic points, which belong mostly to the simpler and older systems; such as the sign of the plural, the sign of the feminine in the suffix pronoun, the points which distinguish between two nouns with the same spelling, between a verb and a participle, between the first personal pronoun used as the subject of a sentence and the same used as the substantive verb, and so on.

The sign of the plural is commonly, but not always, used with numerals.* The pointing is simple, and easily learned and followed. Sometimes, as in all Syriac MSS., the points are wrongly used; a thing at which no one will wonder who tries to write or copy Syriac. The rare mistake of writing a *rish* for a *dolath* occurs a few times in the MS.; twice or more in the case of proper names, and a few times in the case of the particle ܒ. A few cases also occur in the rubricated matter, where the points were regularly added *in black*, after the body of the lines was written, and might easily go astray. The famous example in Luke xxiv. 32, and the less famous one in 2 Cor. iv. 18, occur in the MS. with a *rish* for a *dolath*, but are not to be considered mistakes.

The vocalization is neither rare nor very frequent. It is effected, not by points, except in some apparent, but altogether rare instances, but by the well-known characters of Greek derivation. Several instructive examples (*e. g.*, some in Acts ii.) seem to show that the Arabic *damma* was derived from the Syriac *zeqofo* (ˀ), or, originally, from the Greek *omicron*.† (It is well known that the Arabic *medda* (~) was derived from the Estrangela *aleph* (ܐ).) In the interjection ܐܘ, the Greek vowel *omega* is used to vocalize, as also to distinguish it from the word of the same letters with a diacritic point (ܐܘ), which means *or.* But throughout the MS. the vocalization is chiefly met with in the case of the less frequently occurring proper names, or with foreign words, or with Syriac words when convenient so to distinguish them from others formed of the same letters.

Punctuation is generally used with moderate care. The four points in diamond shape (usually in vermilion about a central black loop) mark either a larger division, or a smaller one of importance, even if the importance be one of sentiment merely, and not grammatical, nor a logical division of the discourse. A lesser point of the same nature is the diamond composed of two black dots horizontal and two red dots vertical, without the central loop or dot. A sentence usually ends with a single dot, like our period, but sometimes with a double dot. The double dot is sometimes upright, sometimes inclined to the right or to the left; but it is not always

---

* I have not been careful to note whether this presence or absence of the plural points follows the rules laid down by the native grammarians.

† This peculiarity is sometimes imitated in print; *e. g.*, in the Syriac Grammar of Henley, London, 1723, a book which seems to be unknown to the bibliographers.

easy to determine whether it leans (virtually; for it often merely follows the slope of a letter-stroke), or whether any difference of meaning attaches by reason of its inclining one way or the other, or standing vertical. It is the rule for the lower one of this double to coincide with the heavy end of an unjoined final *nun* — that is, when placed after a word with such final. Thus these cases have the appearance of a single dot placed at the top of the line, like a Greek colon. But there is no other case, at least no clear one, of this single dot at the top, in the Gospels. In the Acts and onward, it does occur, and not infrequently. The double dot, also, often has its lower one under the final letter, especially in case of an *aleph*. In this case, sometimes, the upper one is omitted; though it sometimes seems to have been thus omitted designedly. These two cases present the only difficulty in copying the MS. in printed type.*

The ambiguities in reading are the usual ones; viz., the difficulty of deciding whether a *shin* or an *'ee* is preceded by a *yud* or a *nun*, or by neither; whether a letter is *'ee* or *kaf;* or whether another is *yud*, *nun*, or *shin;* which last again is sometimes farther complicated by the liability of one of them to be confused with one stroke of a *hheth*.

The punctuation seems to vary with the scribe. Both that and other indications seem to show that the latter part of Luke and all of John were written by a different hand from Matthew and Mark. In the Epistles, also, the variations in punctuation, together with a more modern shape given to the *aleph* when the writing is crowded, and (a very few times) to a *mim* when made by correction from a *waw*, seem to indicate still another scribe.

Sometimes a punctuation mark, especially in the case of the quadruple dot, is transferred from the end of one line to the beginning of the next.

In the Acts and Epistles, quotations from the Old Testament are frequently marked by a short oblique stroke in red, at the beginning of the lines throughout the quotation. Sometimes a black angular mark makes an arrow-head to the inner end of this red mark. The MS. is too much decayed and faded to show whether *all* quotations from the Old Testament were originally so marked.

The evidences of both carefulness and competency on the part of the scribe are abundant in every part of the MS. The errors that

---

* A difficulty which I observe is overcome in the later printed Syriac books.

occur are usually such as to be considered mere slips of the pen, and
not mistakes of the understanding. The writing is carefully and
neatly done ; but yet the manner of crowding letters and words here
and there to make a line come out even, as well as the expansions for
the same purpose, show the hand of one who was more than a mere
copyist; of one who was writing with the freedom of familiarity with
the text, and not mechanically copying an unfamiliar tongue or un-
familiar matter. (Just here it may be mentioned that among the
Nestorians formerly an ecclesiastic was not ordained till he had copied
the necessary service-books with his own hand. Whether that re-
mains the case since the introduction of printing, I am unable to say.)
Abbreviations are rather rare in the *text*, but common in the lesson-
notes or captions, next to be mentioned.

The writing is continuous, without a break from the beginning of
a book to its end; but the titles and subscriptions to each book begin
and follow it, and the captions or notes of the church-lessons are in-
serted in proper place, done in vermilion with the points in black.
Rather oftener than not, the punctuation is wanting both before and
after the lesson-note. The number of the lesson is given in red in
the margin, and signifies only its number in the order in which it
occurs in the text; the other necessary information being contained
in the note or caption just mentioned.

At the end of each book, after its subscription, about four lines,
or three in the case of the Pauline Epistles, are devoted to ornament.
This is of the same sort as that perpetuated in the modern MSS.;
which, again, are regularly copied with scrupulous care from the
most ancient exemplars to be had. At the beginning of Luke the
ornamentation runs across the top and for some distance down the
sides; and in its little squares are the words: "John who is a sinner,
the monk, wrote it." In the little squares in the ornament at the
beginning of Mark is the word "John," which probably refers to the
same scribe (and not to John Mark). In addition to these orna-
ments, others of more or less elaboration surround the *quinio* num-
bers, besides occurring occasionally at the right hand upper and
outer corner of the *verso* of a leaf. In this last position a small dia-
mond of black dots (sometimes a pair of them) is almost always
present; but it does not seem to have any connection with the symbol
of the unity and trinity of God, which regularly holds the like place
in Nestorian sacred MSS. Still further, the numbers of the lesson-
notes, and those of the larger sections, or chapters, presently to be
mentioned, have an unpretentious ornament composed of dots.

Besides the numbers of the lesson-notes, the numbers of the τίτλοι, or κεφάλαια, of the Gospels are given in the margin in red. These correspond almost exactly with those of the Greek as given in Küster's Mill. Certain differences will be noted in another connection.

The only other divisions noted in the margin are the ܦܘܩ̈ܕܐ, or larger sections, the numbers being written in black.

This word ܦܘܩܕܐ is identical with the Arabic word employed to denote the modern chapters ; but in Syriac it means a different division. It is also used indefinitely, in the sense of *pericope*, or passage of Scripture ; and in the plural for the whole Bible, or the whole New Testament, or for a version. In the Gospels these sections are numbered consecutively through the four Gospels as one series, and also separately for each of the four. There is consequently a double set of numbers for them in all the Gospels except Matthew. The Acts and the Catholic Epistles, that is, here, James, 1 Peter, and 1 John, are likewise divided into ܦܘܩ̈ܕܐ and numbered in the margin as one book. Through these books, also, the church-lessons are numbered consecutively, as if one book. In the same way, also, the Epistles of Paul are divided and numbered as one book, both as to ܦܘܩ̈ܕܐ and as to church-lessons.

The ܦܘܩ̈ܕܐ are evidently the same as those in use among the Nestorians, as can be seen both from the Nestorian MS. (12th century) of the Peshitto New Testament at Boston, and from that excellent and very useful edition of the Bible in Ancient and Modern Syriac, the work of Dr. Justin Perkins, printed at Urmî (Oroomiah) in 1846. Indeed, the testimony given by this Perkins Bible is of a rather unusual sort. As printed, the order of books in the New Testament is the same as that of our English Bible, yet the numbering of the series of ܦܘܩ̈ܕܐ which begins in Acts, and is interrupted by Paul's Epistles, is resumed again at James, and carried through 1 Peter and 1 John, without any regard to the interposed book, 2 Peter. The latter, as well as 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse are not divided into ܦܘܩ̈ܕܐ ; but, on the contrary, each of these books has a note at the beginning, stating that it "is not included in the ܦܫܝܛܬܐ that is commonly called the Peshitto, but nevertheless is written in other ancient ܦܫܝܛܬܐ." All this goes to show that this division, or capitulation, is very ancient, and antedates the separation of the Nestorians and Jacobites from the general Syrian church. It shows also

a like antiquity for this order of books in the New Testament, which coincides with that now received among the critical editors of the Greek N. T., except only that it places the Epistle to the Hebrews at the end of the Pauline Epistles — numbering it, however, as one book with them.

As these ܩܦ̈ܠܐ are peculiar to the Syriac versions, and neither very well known nor very accessible, a list of them is here given for that division of the New Testament which comprises the Acts and the Catholic Epistles:

1.	Acts	i.	1.	12.	Acts	xiii.	4.	23.	Acts	xxv.	13.
2.	"	ii.	4.	13.	"	xiii.	44.	24.	"	xxvi.	24.
3.	"	iii.	11.	14.	"	xv.	4.	25.	"	xxvii.	33.
4.	"	iv.	24.	15.	"	xvi.	10.	26.	James	i.	1.
5.	"	v.	29.	16.	"	xvii.	10.	27.	"	ii.	20.
6.	"	vii.	11.	17.	"	xviii.	12.	28.	"	v.	7.
7.	"	vii.	54.	18.	"	xix.	24.	29.	1 Peter	ii.	6.
8.	"	viii.	35.	19.	"	xx.	22.	30.	"	iv.	1.
9.	"	ix.	32.	20.	"	xxi.	27.	31.	1 John	i.	7.
10.	"	x.	30.	21.	"	xxii.	30.	32.	"	iii.	21.
11.	"	xi.	22.	22.	"	xxiv.	1.				

Of these sections, Matthew had 22; Mark, 13; Luke, 23; John, 20; and the Four Gospels together, 78. The Acts alone had 25; the Acts and Catholic Epistles together, 32. The Pauline Epistles, including Hebrews, had 55, (but the last one visible in the MS. is at 2 Timothy iv. 1, number 47). For the whole Peshitto, therefore, the number was 165; and as to the Philoxenian or Harklensian, this MS. shows the division to have coincided with that of the Peshitto through the four Gospels.*

Besides these numbers in the margin, other matters are noted in the subscriptions to the Gospels, which are not marked in either margin or text; unless perhaps in respect to one matter shortly to be

---

* Further testimony to the antiquity and wide use of this capitulation may be seen in a British Museum MS. of the Syriac N. T., (No. 7157), written at Beth-kuko, A. D. 768.   See Dr. W. Wright's article *Verse* in the 2-vol. ed. of *Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature* (New York, 1855), vol. ii. p. 914.   Also, Wright's *Cat. of the Syriac MSS. in the Brit. Mus.* vol. i. (London, 1870); No. 161 (Br. Mus. Add. 12,138), pp. 101–107; a MS. dated A. D. 899; in which the subscription to the notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews gives the numbers of these sections. Wright states that they are "regularly marked on the margin throughout the whole manuscript."   Gregory Bar-hebræus uses the same sections in his Commentary.

mentioned. These will best appear by translating one of the sub-
scriptions. The following is the subscription to Matthew: "Ends
the Gospel of Matthew the apostle, which he spake in Hebrew in
Palestine. His prayer for us, Amen. There are in it *kephalaia* 70;
and the number of *canones* 360. And signs 25, and parables 25,
and testimonies 32. And lessons 74, and sections 22. Pray, for
our Lord's sake, for the sinner that wrote [this]."

Arranged in tabular form, the numbers given in the subscriptions
to the Gospels are as follows:

	Keph.	*Canon.*	*Signs.*	*Par.*	*Test.*	*Less.*	*Sect.*
Matthew, -	70.	360.	25.	25.	32.	74.	22.
Mark, - -	49.	240.	22.	6.	17.	40.	13.
Luke, - -	83.	348.	22.	27.	16.	72.	23.
John, - -	20.	232.	8.	5.	15.	48.	20.

(I have been the more careful to insert these numbers here, be-
cause as originally given in the *Proceedings* A. Or. Soc. mentioned
above, they contain a few mistakes; though these are corrected in a
subsequent number.)

The *canones* are the Eusebian canons, or their Syriac substitute.
Unless these are marked by the largest punctuation mentioned above,
viz., the vermilion diamond with a black centre, they are not marked
in the text. In a number of places this punctuation does exactly
mark off the Greek canons; but that it is anything more than a co-
incidence, I should not venture to say. For, as might be supposed,
the same punctuation occurs regularly at the beginning (or end) of
the κεφάλαια and the ܠܡܝܢ, except when they coincide with the be-
ginning of a lesson; and then punctuation of every sort is *usually*
omitted; as if the rubricated note was warning enough, and supplied
the place of punctuation.

For the "testimonies," etc., so far as the items are liturgical, we
must look to the service-books for information. So far as I can dis-
cover, they are not marked in any way in the text. A hint of the
use of the "testimonies" may be seen in the captions to the Psalms
in some editions of the Syriac Bible; especially in the Psalter which
was the "first labor" of the American press at Urmî, in 1841.

Farther than as above stated, the margin contains nothing except
here and there a word or more that had been omitted by mistake,
and is thus supplied *a prima manu* by writing between the lines or in
the margin, and marking the place in the text by a small $+$, $\div$, $>$,
or $\therefore$, after the fashion of our * etc., to show where the correction

belongs. (The second-hand corrections, a few in number, are so late that I do not notice them here.) There is no Greek margin, nor anything to correspond with what is commonly known as the Harklensian (some still call it the Philoxenian) margin. Only in two or three cases is there a real marginal note; and those are explanatory, and all in the Peshitto Portion. One is at Acts x. 6, where the transliterated βυρσεῖ has a marginal note, duly marked by a ⊥, and reading, "that is, a tanner"; this marginal word for "tanner," by the way, being the one still in use with that meaning in the colloquial Arabic, but having a different meaning in the literary language and the lexicons. A note is also given to explain Paul's appealing to Cæsar (Acts xxv. 11), which it does by calling it "swearing by Cæsar."

It is also to be stated that the codex contains nothing which answers to the *obeli* or asterisks of certain Harklensian MSS. and of White's edition.

Before leaving these accessories of the text, it is proper to speak of their relation to those of other codices which bear some resemblance to this one. In the absence of the Harklensian margins, this MS. agrees with the Codex Mediceo-Florentinus (*anno* 757), described by Adler (*N. T. Versiones Syr.*, pp. 52, ff.), and by him thought to be the true Philoxenian; though thought not so by Bernstein (*Ev. d. Joh.* pp. 1, 2). It likewise agrees with the same codex in the numbers above given from the subscriptions to the Gospels; except only in the κεφάλαια, and in the fact that the lessons and sections are wanting in the Cod. Flor. The differences in the κεφάλαια are shown in the following comparison of the two codices with the Greek numbers as given in Küster's Mill:

					Beirût MS.	Cod. Flor.	Küster's Mill.
Matthew,	-	-	-	- 70	68	68
Mark, -	-	-	-	- 49	48	48
Luke, -	-	-	-	- 83	83	83
John, -	-	-	-	- 20	19	18

In the Beirût MS., the difference in John is made by dividing κεφ. 18 into three κεφάλαια, so as to add two; and the case is similar in Matthew and Mark. However, the *last* number in John (20) and the last in Matthew (70) either never were written or have become obliterated. So it is barely *possible* that the unnumbered beginning of the Gospel was counted in making up the numbers given in the subscription; but the cases of Mark and Luke seem to forbid such a supposition.

The same absence of Harklensian margin appears also in the Cod. Parisinus, described by Adler (*N. T. Vers. Syr.* pp. 55 ff.); but that codex differs in other respects, both external and internal, from the Beirût MS. It agrees with it, however, in giving 70 κεφάλαια of Matthew; but again it gives 40 in Mark—very different from both the Beirût MS. and the Cod. Flor. Its date is A. D. 1212.

The Codex Angelicus (Adler, *idem*, pp. 59 ff.), of unknown date, but about cent. XIV., has some margins, but they seem to be totally different from that known as the Harklensian margin, besides being of a later origin and different purpose. This codex is thought by Bernstein (*Evang. d. Joh.* pp. 3, 4) to be probably the true original Philoxenian.

Other codices of the Harklensian revision or version differ so widely in these accessories that no mention of them is here worth while.

The matter of the church-lessons would require too great space for their discussion here. I will only mention that in the Gospels they differ materially from the scheme given in the Widmanstadt Peshitto (*ed. princeps*) of 1555, and substantially followed in subsequent editions; and seem nearer to the Harklensian scheme given in Adler (*idem*, pp. 67 ff.). In connection with the fact that the Acts and Epistles are in the Peshitto version, it may be well to cite Adler on another point. Speaking of what he calls the "*Missale Syriacum, juxta ritum Jacobitarum*," contained in Cod. Vat. XXXV. (*olim* xxxvi), he remarks: ". . . *quidem pericopæ evangelicæ ad Philoxenianam, epistolicæ autem ad Simplicem pertinent,*" (*idem*, p. 75). And the same is in the main true of the Beirût MS.

III. *Internal, or Textual, Characteristics.*

It is safe, at the outset, to state broadly that the codex represents a very good text, both as regards the Syriac and the Greek; and in the Syriac, as respects both the Philoxenian or Harklensian and the Peshitto portions. In both it presents, in places, a text nearer to the Greek than the printed editions. The question of greatest interest, naturally, is whether it represents in the Gospels the original Philoxenian, or is only one more copy of the Harklensian recension. But in either case it is a MS. of high character. The next question is, how much of a contribution does it form to the material of the New Testament criticism in general, in both Philoxenian and Peshitto.

In discussing the first of these two questions (the only one to be

touched in this paper), it is necessary to keep in mind that the Philoxenian is conceded to have been based upon the Peshitto; and that the Harklensian is, of course, a revision of the Philoxenian.

Two different MSS., as already hinted, have heretofore been supposed to represent the original Philoxenian version. One is the Codex Florentinus, above mentioned (having several features in common with the Beirût MS.), considered by Adler (*N. T. Vers. Syr.*, p. 55) to be the true Philoxenian on account of the absence of the Harklensian margin; but also admitted by him to differ very little in text from the Harklensian recension. This opinion of Adler was rejected by Bernstein (*D. heilige Evang. d. Joh., Krit. Anmerk.*, pp. 1, 2), who thought the Roman Codex Angelicus (cent. XII–XIV.) to be a copy of the true Philoxenian. His main alleged reasons are, that though it has a set of marginal notes, they are of a different if not later character, copied from a different class of MSS., and serving a different purpose ; that it keeps the old Peshitto renderings in more places than the other MSS.; and also, in general, is much less accurate and faithful, and therefore earlier in composition, than either White's edition or the other MSS. of the Harklensian recension. In support of this opinion and these allegations, however, he only gives a partial collation — or rather, a selection of examples from a partial collation — of the first five chapters of the Gospel of John. This is hardly enough to judge by; especially as the variations given are (1.) not exhaustive, and (2.) not of a character sufficiently marked to serve as a basis for sound judgment. (Within the same space the Beirût MS. presents many more variations from White than Bernstein gives of the Cod. Angelicus.)

But it will be better to give Bernstein's argument in a fuller abstract. He first admits (*idem, Krit. Anmerk.*, pp. 25, 26) — against his own theory — that in some of the instances given, the Cod. Angelicus leaves the Peshitto where the other MSS. and White hold to it. The instances which he gives of this sort are 6 in number, and are explained by him as oversights of the copyist. (With regard to these 6 instances, only one seems to have any probable claim to be called an error. In all the 6 the Beirût MS. agrees with the Peshitto.)

Next he gives his strong point. That is a list of 19 places in which, while the Harklensian shows correction and a closer agreement with the Greek, the Codex Angelicus has retained the Peshitto rendering. (But in making up this list, he has had in one instance to separate White's ed. from the 3 MSS. collated, because it agrees

with the Cod. Angel. in that instance; thus reducing the list to 18. And the rest of the list, though a true one, is not strong enough to furnish an argument. Two of the instances depend upon the position of a diacritic point, and that in respect to the third personal pronoun standing for the Greek article; two are insignificant transpositions; and not one of the instances presents a case where a copyist might not easily slip from the one to the other. None of them affects more than one word, and that usually either a prefix conjunction or a suffix pronoun. The strongest instance — strongest indeed of all the proofs presented by Bernstein — is that where the Cod. Angel. reads ܡܬܩܪܐ? (*called*) instead of the Harklensian ܡܬܐܡܪ? (*said*), as a translation of λεγομένην, in the phrase "a village called Sychar." —The Beirût MS. agrees with the Cod. Angel. in 4 of the 19, and is on the fence with regard to a 5th, with perhaps a leaning to the Harklensian.)

He next gives a list of "other places, where it [Cod. Angel.] agrees neither with the Harklensian version nor with the Peshitto." These are 31 in number, and are supposed to exhibit the farther advance in revision made by the Harklensian. But of these 31, in 6 the Harklensian *agrees with the Peshitto* against the Codex Angelicus (!); and one of these agreements is even admitted by Bernstein. In 23 of the remaining ones the Harklensian either agrees so closely with the Peshitto that the difference all but vanishes, or else shows that it is much closer in form to the Peshitto, *i. e.*, it has departed from the Peshitto less, than the Cod. Angelicus. Of the two remaining instances, in one the Cod. Angel. is perceptibly nearer, and in the other *perhaps* a little nearer the Peshitto than the Harklensian reading. (The Beirût MS. agrees with the Cod. Angel. in three of the 31; and in the remaining 27 sides with the Harklensian, though with slight differences.)

A re-arrangement of these selected instances of Bernstein will make the matter clearer:

Where Cod. Angel. and Harkl. differ—

{ Cod. Angel. coincides with Peshitto in   -   -   -   18 instances.
{ Harkl.   "   "   "   "   -   -   -   12   "

{ Cod. Angel. nearer to Peshitto than Harkl. in -   -   2   "
{ Harkl. nearer to Peshitto than Cod. Angel. in -   -   23   "

In the first pair of numbers, Bernstein's hypothesis is favored, as the 18 unrevised of the Cod. Ang. are more than the 12 unrevised of the Harklensian. In the second pair, unless reasons shall appear to

show that a re-revision would bring the Harklensian back again nearer to the Peshitto, Bernstein's hypothesis is opposed, as the 23 less revised of the Harklensian are more than the two of the Cod. Angel. That a re-revision *might* bring the text back again nearer the Peshitto is possible, when either the Greek text was sensibly approached nearer by that means, or a better Syriac idiom was thus secured without sacrificing adherence to the Greek. But if the changes are only those which a copyist might naturally make through inattention, then they go against the hypothesis of a re-revision.

To sum up the facts of Bernstein's argument, then, out of the 56 instances selected to prove his point, one disappears, 20 go in his favor, and 35 against him; while in all of them the lack of proper magnitude or character is painfully manifest. We may well turn back upon Bernstein and his list of select variants from the Cod. Angel., his own words respecting Adler and the Cod. Florentinus: "the variants which it contains are, on the whole, not very important, and neither more numerous nor more significant than in other MSS. of this version." Indeed, these variants furnish nothing to compare with the difference between our Common and Revised English Versions in a space of like extent. And it may be added that Bernstein's partial collation (*idem*, pp. 4-10), from which he selects the above particular proofs, shows many more cases where the Cod. Angel. abandons the Peshitto, but the other MSS. and the printed Harklensian adhere to it.

So far as the above throws light on the Beirût MS., it shows that it adheres to the Peshitto by exact coincidence in several more of the selected instances used as above by Bernstein, than White's edition and the Harklensian MSS.; and also, that it thus adheres to the Peshitto in only two less instances than the Codex Angelicus. In near coincidences it has many more than the Cod. Angel., and nearly as many as the Harklensian.

But the Beirût MS. has some characteristics of its own, which show themselves well enough in a fair and even balance. Far more striking than any — or than all of the above combined, and at the same time the most striking instance in the Beirût MS., is to be found in Matthew xxv. For several verses before the commencement of the Parable of the Ten Virgins, the Peshitto and Harklensian coincide almost exactly; but at xxv. 6 they diverge widely. Now the Beirût MS. keeps up the coincidence with the Peshitto quite to the end of the Parable; so that verses 6-11 inclusive cannot be collated with the Harklensian at all, but must be compared with the Peshitto.

No one has yet cited anything from any other MSS. which at all compares with this instance.

In regard to other cases of adherence to, or rather, of less departure from, the Peshitto, it is scarcely worth while here to go through with Bernstein's *Kritische Anmerkungen* in his *Evang. d. Joh.*, since we have found his selected summary on the point so clearly against his supposition. If of any value here, such a course would be so in the direction of an estimate of the Cod. Florentinus; a side issue of rather too wide an extent to be now attended to. Of other available material, there remains only White's edition, text and notes and margins. With these I have compared the Beirût MS.; and of the results of this comparison I propose to give a short specimen summary; premising, however, that I shall pay no attention at present to differences that consist merely in diacritic points, or to differences in punctuation which really change the interpretation; though in a complete treatise both of these must have their weight.

A few general matters, also, may be stated first, in brief, without stopping to give special instances.

In the first place, the proper names in White's edition and the MSS. which it follows, are commonly spelled after the analogy of the Greek; often as a mere transliteration, and even retaining the Greek case-endings; much of it being a mere attempt slavishly to reproduce the Greek phenomena in a way intolerable to the genius of the Syriac tongue. But in the Beirût MS. the regular practice is uniformly the other way. The proper names, with comparatively few exceptions, are spelled after the Syrian fashion. (This is likewise the case with the MSS. used by Bernstein for his Gospel of John (*D. heilige Evang.*, cited above).) It shows that the Beirût does not follow the more thoroughly revised Harklensian, in any event.

In the spelling of Greek and other words not proper names, adopted by the Syriac (words in which the New Testament Syriac abounds), the same rule obtains throughout. This, again, is generally nothing more than a non-departure from the Peshitto; but sometimes the Peshitto has translated a word or phrase into Syriac where the Harklensian has merely transliterated the Greek. Yet in this case, too, the Beirût MS. generally follows either the literal Peshitto or its analogy. This may be illustrated by an example. In Matt. xix. 28, the phrase ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ is not translated in the Harklensian, but transliterated entire into Syriac letters; the whole phrase being crammed together into one word, just like the Greek uncial margin which is given for explanation. But the Beirût MS.

gives a Syriac rendering, ܚܘܣܐ ܡܚܠܝܙܝ, strictly equivalent to
the Greek in sense, and of a form to be represented exactly by ἐν τῷ
πάλιν γενέσθαι. It uses here common Peshitto words, but not the
Peshitto rendering, which last happens to be ܚܕܬܚܐ ܒܥܠܡܐ, or "*in
the new æon.*" Close to the same example (I cite them merely be-
cause they are handy) are three other adherences to the Peshitto,
either of them stronger than any instance cited by Bernstein in favor
of the Cod. Angelicus. In Matt. xix. 24 we have the Syriac for
"camel" in place of the Harklensian transliteration of the corrupt
κάμιλος, or cable; in verse 27 we have the Peshitto phrase "Cephas
answered and said," for the Harklensian "when Peter responded he
said"—a difference in every word of the phrase, as well as in the
characteristic idiom of the whole. In verse 28 we have the Peshitto,
not the Harklensian, word for "tribes" (of Israel). In the face of
such differences as these, which abound in the Beirût MS., the dif-
ferences alleged for the Cod. Angel. fade away into nothing. But
one more example may be given to illustrate another sort of differ-
ence just mentioned. In John xix. 2 the "crown" (of thorns), in
the Beirût MS. is the Syriac and Peshitto ܟܠܝܠܐ; but White has a
transliteration of στέφανον, retaining even the accusative form. But
this case is merely one for illustration; for Bernstein's John, with the
MSS. there collated, agree with the Beirût MS. in this example;
while White's note says that his MSS. give ܟܠܝܠܐ in margin, and
that the Codex Barsalibæi has ܟܠܝܠܐ in text and στέφανον in margin.
But numerous cases occur where a similar fact is confined to the
Beirût MS.

There is one case in the Beirût MS. which at first sight seems to
look the other way. In Luke vii. 44, 45, from "she hath washed"
to "thou gavest me no kiss," White's ed. follows the Peshitto; while
for the last half-dozen words the Beirût MS. gives a rendering entirely
after the Harklensian (or Philoxenian) idiom, slavishly reproducing
the Greek order of words. But a note of White states that this
clause is wanting in the Ridley MS. (the basis of his edition), and
that he supplied it from a Bodleian MS. Thus the effect of this case
is to show that the Beirût MS. has kept a clause which the Ridley
MS. copyist had omitted, and which the editor had supplied from
the Peshitto.

But in order to come nearer to a proper estimate of the position of
this MS. in this respect, it is best to remark briefly upon the main
characteristic differences between the Peshitto and the Harklensian.

Nothing is clearer (to repeat a little) than that the latter is a revision derived from the former, though we know that there was one intervening step. The general genius of the revision may be in some measure imagined by comparing the noble version of Luther with the wooden one of De Wette; but the parallel must not be strained. Aside from characteristics already mentioned, the Peshitto phrases, clauses, sentences, and even passages extending through a number of verses, appear here and there unchanged; then, again, with transpositions, inversions, expansions, and contractions; with the insertion of a word on the one hand, or its omission, on the other; here and there a slight change in only a word or two, and then again a complete difference in words and structure. In short, it shows all the phenomena of a revision from the free, the idiomatic, and the occasionally paraphrastic, to the close and literal. But, still farther than this, there is a continual attempt to exhibit what may be called the surface phenomena of the Greek, such as almost parallels the LXX. use of the preposition σύν with the accusative to show the presence of את in the Hebrew text. Prominent among such characteristics are the use of an additional word instead of the idiomatic suffix pronoun, thus giving an undue emphasis to the Greek possessive αὐτοῦ, and the like; the attempt to represent the Greek article by certain pronouns of the third person, often with an effect much less happy than Beza's use of *ille* for a like purpose (though a diacritic point generally shows whether the pronoun has the force of the article, or that of a demonstrative or even relative pronoun); the exchange of the idiomatic succession of two finite verbs with — or even without — a conjunction for ܟ before a verb or a participle, in order to represent the various Greek participial constructions; the use of the pronoun ܗܘ (always with a diacritic point) to reproduce the effect (if not the sound and appearance) of the Greek particle μέν*; with other almost constant changes, mostly pleonastic in form, which need not be enumerated, but which no reader of the Syriac versions can miss. It is in the matter of these characteristic marks, rather than in any great variety or essential difference of rendering, that the Philoxenian, or any other intermediate step, from the Peshitto to the Harklensian as we have it, is to be recognized.

Other things being equal, this intermediate revision would be expected, among other matters, to show:

---

* This peculiarity occurs in Syriac outside of the Harklensian and Pococke's Epistles and De Dieu's Apocalypse, *e. g.*, in *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite*, edited by Dr. W. Wright (Cambridge, 1882).

(1.) A greater number of exact coincidences with the Peshitto.

(2.) More cases where the departure from the Peshitto in form or phraseology would be less; that is, more cases *nearly* coincident.

(3.) In cases of difference from the Peshitto in form and shades of rendering, where the Peshitto adheres closely to the Greek: often, but not always, a *less* adherence to the Peshitto; since the later revision would be likely to take a return step in matter, and *perhaps* even in form, provided either a nearer approach to the Greek or a better Syriac idiom with equal closeness to the Greek could be thus secured. (It is this consideration which appears to lie at the basis of Bernstein's argument in his list of places where the Codex Angelicus differs from both Peshitto and Harklensian; as his citations of the Greek in that list would show. But his list shows only very slight differences at best, and those more in form than in shades of meaning; and none of them important; while there is nothing cumulative in the sum. Further, the little weight they seem to have disappears on actual comparison with the Peshitto.) But these cases actually involve some other considerations, such as possible changes in the Syriac language since the Peshitto took its final form, concerning which we have few or no data for judging. And in general, these cases are to be weighed, rather than counted; and to be treated with care and discrimination throughout.

(4.) Though not decisive, the proper names and foreign words should be spelled or transferred after the common Syriac (or at least the Peshitto) fashion, and not merely transliterated into Syriac letters.

Now, to apply this roughly, I have put together the following results from the Gospel of Matthew in the Beirût MS. It begins at Matt. xii. 20, and lacks xiii. 28–57, xvii. 20—xix. 12, xxv. 11—xxvi. 21; leaving about the amount of fifteen chapters as the material here summarized.

Leaving out of view (as already suggested) all differences which consist merely in *points* (though those are often important, and were used by Bernstein in his argument for the Cod. Angelicus), and considering no variations that amount to less than an actual letter of the text, I find in this fragment of Matthew about 347 differences between the Beirût MS. and the edition of White—counting each passage as one difference, without regard to how many minor differences it may comprise.

Of these, first, where both differ from the Peshitto, 32 may be called unimportant differences; but in the large majority of them,

White's ed. gives what we may well call ultra-Harklensian character-
istics.   In only 2 does the Beirût MS. show a stronger Harklensian
tendency than White; while in one, White shows a decided revision
of the B. MS. form.   It should be said, however, that in 6 of these
cases, the B. MS. coincides with readings given in White from the
Cod. Barsalibæi, which is apparently one of those Harklensian copies
which favor the Syriac genius rather than imitate the Greek.   So far,
the B. MS. looks more unrevised by a preponderance very great and
easy to see, but not easy to express in numbers nearer than 30 to 2.

As to proper names, the differences are about 60.   Of these the
B. MS. has 55 spelled in the Syriac fashion, and 33 of these in the
exact form given in the Peshitto.   In the other 5, White is nearer the
Syriac fashion, though not once coincident with a Peshitto form;
and in one of the 5 the B. MS. would be nearer the Syriac fashion
had it not committed an obvious error in spelling—a pure clerical
error.   Thus the numbers should rather stand 56 to 4 than 55 to 5.

In the matter of differences with respect to Greek words which are
not proper names, the B. MS. follows the Syriac style and genius in
16 instances, one of them being the exact Peshitto form; while
White follows the Syriac style and genius in only 1.   In one instance,
White's margin agrees with both B. MS. and Peshitto.   Thus this
preponderance in favor of the unrevised condition of B. MS. stands
16 to 1; with one of the number showing that the makers of White's
text had the variant before their eyes when they did their revising.

Before proceeding to the more important points, it is necessary to
make a remark about the manifest errors of the scribe in the B. MS.,
and those of the printer in White's ed., in the portion here sum-
marized.   In the writing of B. MS., they amount to about 23; of
which 3 are serious *homoioteleuta*, one a palpable omission, and one a
plainly accidental transposition; all the rest being minor ones, though
sometimes such as to seem to bear differently from their manifest
corrections upon the results of this summary.   The errors in W.,
likewise, I find to be about 6.   At the same time, I may mention,
that of the more important variations caused by a difference in Greek
text, W. is best in about 8 instances; one because of a difference in
the spelling of B., and once because of an apparent error in B.,
though there it agrees with W.'s margin.   B., likewise, represents a
better Greek text in about 8 instances; one of them, however, being
its better reading of the interpolated verse, Matt. xxi. 44.   Both
these matters, with others to appear, have an important bearing on
the numbers next to be discussed.

Of these, first, are the exact coincidences with the Peshitto, where the two differ from each other.   At the first rough taking out, there stand 81 coincidences of the Beirût MS. against 65 of White's ed.; or, in coincidences which tally to the very letter, in favor of the superior antiquity of B. in a ratio a little less than 9 to 7.   But from the 65 of W. we must first deduct 2, which White in his notes acknowledges as his own corrections of the MS., leaving 63.   Ten more must go, where the difference is caused only by a manifest clerical error in B., of omission or the like, palpable to any reader, and two of them mere misspellings; leaving 53.   Ten more must go, for letters in B. which either stand for the grammatical contraction of a main word with its expletive, or accidental differences which show no intention to depart from the Peshitto, but a plain intention to adhere to it, and which are actually within the range of the Peshitto's variant readings.   This leaves 43; and now we may proceed to examine their essential character.   Only 3 of them amount to so much as the omission of or the rendering by an essentially different word on the part of B.; and then B. departs from Peshitto in one place to follow the Curetonian Syriac, once to follow the Greek against the Peshitto, and once to agree with W.'s margin.   The rest are differences of slight moment; 3 being by mere transposition; and only 6 by as much as an additional word, and that sometimes only by way of difference in grammatical form (such as frequently occurs in different MSS. or edd. of the Peshitto), and sometimes an insignificant particle.   Out of the whole number (whether 65 or 43), it should be stated, B. agrees with W.'s margin in but three instances; which fact may be looked upon as a probable indication of their existence earlier than the text of W., and as possibly reducing the strength of this numerical array by that amount.

But the 81 of B. must be discussed before we can resume the comparison.   Here, however, we meet with but 4 which are unessential transpositions, but not one that in any way can be made to disappear.   As against the three where W.'s adherence to the Peshitto differs from B. by as much as an essentially different word, and all of those leaning in favor of B.'s priority as a version, B. has 7 adherences which differ from W. by as much as an essential word.   As against the 1 of W. by B.'s omission (that, too, being one of the last 3), B. has 11 by W.'s omission, one of them amounting to 4 words.   As against the 6 by addition, B. has 10.   But in other cases, where the difference is an essential one in the rendering and phraseology, 1 place covers 3 words, 2 cover each 4 words (one of them a

case where W. has adopted a different Greek), and one is a long passage covering 60 words, where W. differs *toto cælo* from the Peshitto.

Now we can compare the 81 with the 65.   The 81 stand, while the 65 diminish at once to 43.   But the chief one of the 81 is enough to swallow up the 43, and leave still a numerical surplus.   But if not so, yet each of the more important ones of the 43 is immensely overmatched in both number and quality out of the 81; sometimes in the ratio of 2 to 1, and sometimes by ratios too large to measure; while its minor ones are outnumbered nearly 2 to 1.   In comparison with this, Bernstein's arguments in favor of the Codex Angelicus dwindle to the veriest shadow.

But there remain two more points to attend to.   One of these is those cases of difference where the rendering of one or the other is so near that of the Peshitto as to be essentially the same; differing often only by a single letter, and at most only by such small matters as show that no departure from that version was contemplated, unless required by grammatical correction, or some equally minor cause. In this respect, B. has 12 instances, and W. 3.   In one of the 3 B. differs only by a manifest error, and in another because it follows the Curetonian Syriac.   So the numbers might more justly stand 12 to 2; while 1 of the 2 still furnishes argument for the priority of B. over W.

The last point of the summary concerns those differences in which, though both differ from the Peshitto in rendering, or, at least, essentially in form, one is nearer to the Peshitto in meaning than the other.   Up to this time, I have not developed this point as thoroughly as the others, and therefore lay no stress upon it at present; but I will give the numbers.   As might have been expected from what has been learned of the other results, the direction of the numerical inequality is reversed.   W. stands 36 to B. 18.   The 36, however, ought in fairness to be diminished by 2; once because of a palpable omission of B.—an apparent *homoioteleuton*, but really following a better text; and again for its manifest error; thus leaving the numbers 34 to 18.   So far, it looks perfectly consistent with the supposition that W. had approached nearer to the Peshitto *in sense* by a re-revising.   To this add the fact that in one of the 18 B. agrees with W.'s margin.   Furthermore, as if to furnish the proof that the onward course of revisers always has an inevitable back eddy or two, B. has one very striking instance, covering 3 words, where the re-revision of W. (if really such) must be looked upon as resulting in a nearer

approach to the Peshitto in its nice correctness of both sense and language.

Before leaving the subject, just one more important consideration should be added.   The dependence of the Harklensian Epistles of 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude upon the version first published by Pococke (Leyden, 1627), and since generally published with the Peshitto, has been often noticed.   The Harklensian are certainly a revision of the latter, and a great improvement; for whether the latter were the original Philoxenian or not, they do not equal the Peshitto in merit.   Now the items which make up this revision plainly lie in the direction above pointed out, in the changes from the Peshitto to the Harklensian.   The changes from Pococke to Harklensian are less radical in style (except in mere transpositions) than those from Peshitto to Harklensian; though they are evident enough.   In matter of rendering, however, that is, in differences of word or phrase, the differences are at least as great.   But all this is to be accounted for from the fact that the Pococke Epistles probably had no Peshitto basis; and at the same time, are a much later work, and more like the later Secular writings in form and style.   Revision to the Harklensian style would naturally change the words more, and the style less.   But in comparing the Beirût MS. with the Harklensian, there is everywhere manifest the same kind of differences as in the case of the change from the Pococke to the Harklensian; only, as the Beirût MS. came originally from a Peshitto basis (the same basis, indeed, as the Harklensian), the changes in the essential words and phrases of rendering are not relatively so many; while those in form and style are much the same.   It is hard to resist the impression that the Beirût Gospels stand to the Harklensian Gospels in about the same relation as the Pococke Epistles to the Harklensian Epistles.

Whether this codex be the lost Philoxenian or not, it certainly presents the strongest claims yet apparent for that identification.   It is beyond a doubt an earlier revision than the Harklensian of White; and, so far as I am able to judge, than that of any other MS. known.

On Job. xix. 25–27.

BY REV. J. I. MOMBERT, D. D.

25 יַעֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי גֹּאֲלִי חָי וְאַחֲרוֹן עַל־עָפָר יָקוּם׃

26 וְאַחַר עוֹרִי נִקְּפוּ־זֹאת וּמִבְּשָׂרִי אֶחֱזֶה אֱלוֹהַּ׃

27 אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי ׀ אֶחֱזֶה־לִּי וְעֵינַי רָאוּ וְלֹא־זָר כָּלוּ כִלְיֹתַי בְּחֵקִי׃

The object of this paper is twofold: 1. to trace the history of the passage as it stands in the Authorized Version; and 2. to submit the summary of an interpretation.

I. The history of the passage.

It is taken for granted that the line of succession begins with the Hebrew in the form here presented, and runs through the Septuagint, the Itala and Vulgate, Wiclif, Matthew, Coverdale, Genevan and the Bishops', and that the Chaldee paraphrase, the Syriac and Arabic among the ancients, Luther, Olivetan, Pagninus, Münster and Tremellius, etc., among the more modern, have directly or indirectly influenced the English version. To these should, possibly, be added the names of Diodati and Cassiodoro, as well as that of Castalio. It is unnecessary to state the reasons here, as they are, of course, known to the members of this Society.

Beginning, then, with the LXX., we meet the following text:

25. οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἀένναός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων ἐπὶ γῆς ·

26. ἀναστήσει δέ μου τὸ δέρμα (τό σῶμα) τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα. παρὰ γὰρ κυρίου μοι ταῦτα συνετελέσθη,

27. ἃ ἐγὼ ἐμαυτῷ συνεπίσταμαι, ἃ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου ἑωράκασι, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος · πάντα δέ μοι συντετέλεσται ἐν κόλπῳ.

The various readings of moment are: 25. ἐγὼ for γὰρ in Compl. and some MSS.; ἀέναός A and some MSS.; comma after μέλλων, Roman edition of B.;   26. ἀναστῆσαι τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀναντλοῦν, ταῦτά μοι B.; 27. ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου ἑώρακε, B.

It is also proper to add that Theodotion (*Hexapla*) renders:

25. ὁ ἀγχιστεύς μου ζῇ, καὶ ἔσχατον ἐπὶ χώματος ἀναστήσει.

27. Ἐξέλιπον οἱ νεφροί μου ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου.

There seems little doubt that the old Septuagintal reading is generally expressed in the old Sixtine rendering (see Walton and Jager): 25. "*Scio enim quia aeternus est qui me resoluturus est, super terram 26 ad resuscitandam cutem meam quæ perpetitur hæc: a Domino enim hæc mihi consummata sunt, 27 quorum ego mihi conscius sum, quæ oculus meus* [or, *plural*] *vidit, et non alius, et omnia mihi consummata sunt in sinu.*"   In v. 25, however, *quod* seems preferable to *quia*, and ἀναστήσει the more accepted reading, according to Origen (*Hexapla*) at least, appears to have belonged to v. 25, and conformed to the Hebrew; yet, while he renders the latter, ". . .   *redemptor meus vivit et novissime super pulverem staturus,*" his Greek κοινή is represented by . . . "*perennis est qui soluturus me est super terra.*"   The rendering of Theodotion is unsupported and an interpretation rather than a translation.   The most interesting and, perhaps, instructive rendering is that of חַי by ἀέναος, which I regard as a key-word to the meaning; as to the form of the word, that with a double ν, being the less usual, is probably the best sustained; as composed of ἀεί and νάω, it signifies primarily, ever-flowing, and then perennial, everlasting, ever-living, eternal,—so that we may understand the clause to carry the sense that, in the opinion of the Seventy, Job held that ὁ ἐκλύειν is eternal, and that disposes of Theodotion's ἀγχιστεύς, although it is cited by Theodoret.—v. 26, tested by the Hebrew, seems to be pure paraphrase, conversion, or conjecture; it makes, of course, good sense, but at the expense of grammar and the omission or addition of words; *e. g.*, it contains no trace of וְאַחַר and מִבְּשָׂרִי, renders נִקְּפוּ־זֹאת τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα, inserts or substitutes for אֶחֱזֶה אֱלֹהַּ παρὰ γὰρ—συνετελέσθη. The changes introduced are so startling, that either a text now unknown must have been the basis of their rendering, or they must have drawn on their imagination for a solution of the difficulties. v. 27 they connect אֲשֶׁר, rendered ἃ, with the mysterious ταῦτα of v. 26, express אֶחֱזֶה־לִּי by ἐμαυτῷ συνεπίσταμαι, confound כָּלוּ כִלְיֹתַי with some form which they felt justified to render: πάντα δέ μοι συνέτελεσται, in which rendering the noun entirely disappears, and an enigmatical כֹל looms up

in the shape of πάντα. Their way of evolving this rendering from the next is very amusing, and sheds light on the origin of the various readings. Their Hebrew text was unpointed and written in uncials, thus:

<div dir="rtl">כליכליתיבחקי</div>

which they resolved into or spelt out: כלי כל יתי בחקי, translating as above, and taking יתי, the Chaldee for אֹתִי, as the equivalent of לִי.

As to the real meaning of the ancient Septuagintal rendering, the old Italic version, which was made from it, bears testimony; it seems to have stood thus:

"*Scio enim quia æternus est qui me resoluturus est, super terram resurget cutis mea, quæ hæc patitur: a Domino enim mihi haec contigerunt, quorum ego mihi conscius sum, quæ oculus meus vidit et non alius, et omnia mihi consummata sunt in sinu.*" The variant renderings in the Latin text given above, immediately after the Septuagint, indicate the changes made by Sixtus V. in the edition of 1587; while that which follows shows the alterations introduced into the Paris Polyglot (ed. 1645). " . . . *qui solvere me debet, super terram suscitare pellem meam quæ tolerat hæc. Ab enim Domino haec mihi confecta sunt. Quae ego . . . alius; omnia autem . . .*"

The old Italic text, with numerous variations, was that out of which has grown the Vulgate, and it may be instructive to see how the latter stood in 1557 (ed. Bryling):

"*Scio enim quod redemptor meus vivit, et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum. Et rursum circumdabor pelle mea, et in carne mea videbo Deum. Quem visurus sum ego ipse, et oculi mei conspecturi sunt, et non alius, reposita est haec spes mea in sinu meo.*"

A glance suffices to show that this text is not based on the Septuagint and the Itala, and the question arises, which is its basis? We answer, Jerome's; and it is not only based on it, but it is Jerome's translation *verbatim et literatim.*

Now, this text departs very widely, and perhaps audaciously, from the Hebrew text, for it presents the following variants:

Hebrew.	Jerome.
עַל־עָפָר יָקוּם	מֵעָפָר אָקוּם
נִקְּפוּ	נַקַּפְתִּי
מִבְּשָׂרִי	בִּבְשָׂרִי

For these departures Jerome assigns no reasons in his translation or in his commentary, and I have not been able to discover any reason for them in the Hebrew MSS. or in the ancient versions. Of the latter, I produce now from Walton the Chaldee Paraphrase, and the Syriac and Arabic versions in Latin.

Chaldee Paraphrase:

"*Et ego scio quia redemptor meus vivit, et post haec redemptio ejus consurget super pulverem. Et postquam inflata fuerit pellis mea, erit hoc: et de carne mea videbo iterum Deum. Quem ego visurus sum mihi, et oculi mei videbunt, et non alius: consumpti sunt renes mei in sinu meo.*"

This paraphaase is far less paraphrastic than the Septuagint, and sustains, with due allowance for several peculiar and not very elegant terms, the grammatical structure of the Hebrew text as placed at the head of this paper.

Syriac and Arabic version:

"*Ego quidem scio quod Salvator meus vivens sit, et in consummatione super terram appariturus. Et pellem meam angustaverunt* haec et carnem meam. Si viderint oculi mei Deum, videbunt lumen. Renes mei penitus perierunt de loco meo.*"

This version, probably as ancient as the Chaldee Paraphrase, is considered to have been made direct from the Hebrew. The text of the passage under notice, however, must have been in many respects different from the Hebrew, if de Rossi's statement of its literalness and great fidelity is to be accepted. Dr. Credner thinks that it has been influenced by the Chaldee and the Septuagint, but it is not improbable that the original version was corrected by or adapted to them at a later period by Syrian transcribers. Structurally, the version conforms to the Hebrew text in v. 25, for it ends with יָקוּם, but forsakes it in the subsequent verses, which it seems extremely difficult, if not impossible, to conform to it. It is not improbable, however, that some of the innovations of Jerome have been suggested by this version.

At this stage it may be proper to turn to the English versions.

Wiclif (Forshall and Madden):

" Forsothe I wot that myn agheenbiere liveth, and in the laste dai I am to rise fro the erthe; and eft shal ben enuyround with my skin, and in my flesh I shal se God, *my sauere*. Whom I myself am to seen, and myn eyhen ben to beholden, and noon other. This myn hope is led vp in my bosum."

This is doubtless the first English basis of our present version. With the solitary interpolation of *my sauere*, it is a literal translation of the Hieronymian text of the Vulgate as given above.

The next English version was doubtless influenced by the continental versions, more especially by those of Luther and the Zürich. Luther's translation of Job appeared in 1524, and the text ran as follows:†

---

*Circumdederunt hæc.

†In almost every instance the extracts given preserve the original spelling and punctuation of the editions from which they have been taken.

Luther (ed. Hans Luft, fo. 1545.)

Aber ich weis das mein Erlöser lebet, vnd er wird mich hernach aus der Erden auffwecken. Vnd werde darnach mit dieser meiner haut umbgeben werden, vnd werde in meinem fleisch Gott sehen. Den selben werde ich mir sehen, vnd meine augen werden jn schawen, vnd kein frembder. Meine nieren sind verzeret in meinem schos.

English Translation.

But I know that my Redeemer liveth, aud he will afterwards awake me out of the earth. And thereupon *I* shall be surrounded with this my skin, and *I* shall see God in my flesh. The same I shall see for myself, and my eyes shall behold him, and not a stranger. My reins are consumed in my lap.

Concerning this version it is proper to say that the influence of the Vulgate against the Hebrew is very pronounced, for it preserves all the objectionable renderings of the former, except in v. 27 which follows the latter.

The Zürich version came out in 1527–1530, and brought the passage in the form here given:

Zürich (ed. Froschower, fo. 1531.)

Dann ich weiss das mein retter und schirmer läbt, vnd das ich der tag eins aus dem Kaat wider aufston wird, vnd das *meine glider* mit diser haut wider überzogen werdend, vnd das ich mit meinem fleisch bekleidet Gott anschouwen wird. Ja ich selber wird jnn anschauwen, nit mit andern, sunder mit disen meinen augen. Meine nieren werdend in mir verzeert.

English Translation.

For I know that my saviour and protector liveth, and that some day I shall rise again out of the dirt, and that *my members* shall be again covered over with this skin, and that clothed with my flesh I shall look upon (*or*, behold) God. Yea, I myself shall look upon (*or* behold) him, not with other but with these my eyes. My reins shall be consumed within me.

This version is undoubtedly a revision of Luther, with certain paraphrastic amplifications, a marked debasement of expression, and a good deal of conjecture. Both the additions and changes show the revision did not follow the Hebrew text.

The first *complete* English Bible is Coverdale's, published in 1535, and our passage stands in it as follows:

" For I am sure, that my redeemer lyueth, and that I shall rise out of the earth in the latter day: that I shal be clothed againe with this skynne, and se God in my flesh. Yee I myself shal beholde him, not with other, but with these same eyes. My reines are consumed within me. . . ."

Collating this with Luther, the Zürich, and the Vulgate as well as Wicklif, we get these results:*

FOR ⎰ dann Z. ⎱ I AM SURE ⎰ Forsothe I wot W. ⎱ . . . REDEEMER
　　 ⎱ enim V. ⎰　　　　　 ⎰　　　　　　　　　 ⎱
　　 ⎰ agheenbiere W. ⎱ . . AND THAT ⎰ vnd das Z. ⎱ I SHALL RISE OUT OF
　 ⎱ redemptor　 V. ⎰　　　　　　 ⎱　　　　　 ⎰
　　 ⎱ Erlöser　　 L. ⎰

THE EARTH ⎧ I am to rise from ⎤ IN THE LATTER ⎰ in the laste dai　 W. ⎱
　　　　 ⎪　　 the erthe　 W. ⎥ DAYE　　　 ⎱ in novissimo die V. ⎰
　　　　 ⎪ aus dem Kaat　　 ⎥
　　　　 ⎨　 wider auf-　　　 ⎬
　　　　 ⎪　 ston wird　 Z.　 ⎥
　　　　 ⎪ de terra sur-　　 ⎥
　　　　 ⎩ recturus sum V.　 ⎦

THAT I SHAL BE CLOTHED AGAINE ⎰ and eft shal ben enuyroned　 W. ⎱
　　　　　　　　　　　　　 ⎱ bekleidet (transposed)　　 Z. ⎰
THIS SKYNNE ⎰ dieser [meiner] Haut L. ⎱ . . . YEE I MYSELF ⎰ ja ich　　 ⎱
　　　　 ⎱ deser Haut　　　 Z. ⎰　　　　　　 ⎱ selber Z. ⎰

. . . NOT WITH OTHER, BUT WITH THESE SAME EYES ⎧ nit mit andern, ⎤
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　 ⎪ sunder mit di- ⎥
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　 ⎨ sen meinen　 ⎬
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　 ⎩ augen　　 Z. ⎦
. . . CONSUMED WITHIN ME ⎰ sind verzeret in meinem Schos　 L. ⎱
　　　　　　　　　　 ⎱ werdend in mir verzeert　　　 Z. ⎰

In other words, Coverdale's version of the passage does not contain a single word that gives evidence of a direct reference to the Hebrew. It is not necessary to produce Matthew (folio 1537), for it agrees literally with Coverdale (1535). But it is curious that about 1550 in his translation of Wermüller's *Hope of the Faithful*, he introduces the passage essentially changed, viz.: "For I am sure that my Redeemer liueth; and that he shall stand ouer the dust, or earth, in the latter day; that I shall be clothed agayne with this skynne, and se God in my flesh. Yee, I myself, or, for myself, shall behold him, not another, but with these same eyes." The reason for the changes may be found in his having probably become acquainted with Leo Judae's Latin translation, a rendering of the Septuagint, or Sebastian Münster's version, or he simply rendered the passage as Wermüller gave it. Still another version, not yet mentioned, may have been consulted by Coverdale, although it was published in the same year as his *editio princeps*, which, if printed in Switzerland, would of course raise the possibility into probability. The version of Olivetan, to which I refer, is in some respects very striking, and has, if not directly, certainly indirectly influenced in succession the Genevan, the Bishops' and the Authorized Version. As copies of that edition are extremely rare, and examples seldom met with, I give its

---

*The words in small capitals denote Coverdale's text, and the letters L. V. W. Z. stand for Luther, Vulgate, Wiclif and the Zürich.

rendering here: "Car ie scay bien que mon redempteur vit, et* qu' il me resuscitera sur la terre au dernier iour. Et combien que les vers ayent ronge ceste chair apres ma peau: toutes foys ie verray Dieu en ma chair. Lequel je contempleray en moy, & mes yeuls le regarderont et non autre: mes reins sont defaillis a mon sein."

It is proper to state that Olivetan is not original, as appears from the rendering of Pagninus, here presented, which was published in 1528.

"25. Et ego novi Redemptorem meum vivum, & novissimum qui super terram surget, 26. Et post pellem meam *contritam, vermes*, con-triverunt hanc *carnem*, et de carne mea videbo Deum. 27. Quem ego visurus sum mihi, & oculi mei videbunt, & non alienus: defecerunt renes mei in sinu meo."

The words: *Car je sais bien*, bear a closer resemblance to Coverdale's *For I am sure*, than Wiclif's *Forsothe I wot*, and if Coverdale saw Olivetan before his Bible was published, the presumption that he adopted that phrase is very strong. Variety and inconsistency mark the versions with which he was connected, and the passage before us furnishes a striking illustration of those characteristics, for although the version in *Hope of the Faithful* contains renderings derived from the Hebrew, a copy of Cranmer (1539) printed by Cawood in 1568 agrees *verbatim* with Coverdale (1535) and Matthew (1537).

The editions of Taverner likewise present no change whatsoever, except as to the spelling. But the text underwent a tremendous change in the Genevan (1560), as will be seen by comparison:

Coverdale—Matthew—Cranmer.	Genevan (1560).
For I am sure, that my redeemer lyueth, and that I shall rise out of the earth in the latter daye: that I shal be clothed againe with this skynne, and se God in my flesh. Yee I myself shal beholde him, not with other, but with these same eyes. My reynes are consumed within me.	For I am sure that my Redeemer liueth, and HE shall STAND THE LAST ON the earth. AND THOGH AFTER MY SKIN *wormes* DESTROY this *bodie*, YET SHAL I se God in my flesh. WHOM I my self shal SE, AND MINE eies shal beholde, AND NONOTHER *for me, thogh* my reines are consumed within me.

In this collation the words in small capitals and italics indicate the changes; that remarkable version reflects the mind, if it does not reveal the hand of Calvin, Münster, Leo Judæ and Pellican, in addition to the English refugees by whom it was set forth. The version may be said to have been translated direct from the Hebrew, with due consultation and use of the ancient versions and Pagninus, as reference will show. The Genevan translators retained from Coverdale-Cranmer the clause "For I am sure that my Redeemer liveth," which Olivetan had rendered:

---

* *Margin:* Aucûs qu'il est le dernier qui sera debout sur la terre.

"Car je sais bien que mon redempteur vit;" in the next clause: "and
he shall stand the last on the earth" they adhered to the Hebrew for the
3d pers. sing. future, and the LXX. ἀναστήσει, but weighed the state-
ment of Münster "potest et sic iste locus reddi, *novissimus resurget
in pulvere*," and the rendering of Leo Judæ: "et novissimum qui super
terram surget;" the *super terram* also is expressed in Olivetan's "*sur
la terre*." The Chaldee and Syriac likewise sustained that rendering.
To the same French version and Pagninus they seem to be indebted for
"and thogh after my skin *wormes* destroy this bodie," that being an
almost literal translation of "Et combien que les vers ayent ronge
ceste chair," the "chair" (flesh) being changed into "bodie," probably
suggested by σῶμα; even the "yet" is a literal reproduction of "toutes-
foys." In the next clause: "Whom I myself shal se," they adhere
closely to the Hebrew and the Chaldee, after whom Olivetan trans-
lated "Lequel ie contempleray en moy," and Leo Judæ: "*quem
ego visurus sum mihi*." The Chaldee (q. v.) and Leo Judæ's "*et
oculi mei conspecturi sunt*" they regarded as true renderings of the
Hebrew, and translated: "and mine eies shal beholde." The only
original addition in the next clause is the interpretative *for me:* זָר they
render *alius*, not *alienus;* in the last clause "thogh" is an ingenious
amplification.

Summing up, then, the Genevan version, mainly after Olivetan, intro-
duced a rendering which, though in many respects close to the Hebrew,
inserted *worms* and *bodie* without any warranty of the original, while
it discarded "the latter daye" of Coverdale, and "the laste dai" of
Wiclif.

The Bishops' Bible, published in 1568, presented the passage as it
stands in the collation which follows:

Genevan (1560).	Bishops' (1568).
For I am sure that my Redeemer liueth, and he shal stand the last on the earth. And thogh after my skin *wormes* destroy this *bodie*, yet shal I se God in my flesh. Whom I my self shal se, and mine eies shal beholde, and nonother *for me, thogh* my reines are consumed within me.	For I am sure that my redeemer lyueth, and he shal rayse vp at the latter day them that lye in the dust. And though after my skin the (*wormes*) destroy this body, yet shal I see God in my fleshe: Whom I mee selfe shal see, and mine eyes shall beholde, and none other for me, though my reynes are consumed within me.

Dr. Andrew Pearson, who had charge of the revision of Job, can
hardly be said to have earned golden laurels for this version of the
passage, which, with the exception of the second clause of v. 25, the
addition of "the" before *wormes*, and certain changes in spelling,

agrees *verbatim* with the Genevan; but that second clause, while it restores "the latter day" discarded by the Genevan, and never abandoned in the Coverdale-Cranmer series of Bibles, introduces a theological dogma without any intimation that "them that lie in the" are supplied, and very poorly supplied, for how can *in* be got out of עַל־עֲפָר ? It could not be got out of it, and therefore he put it into it; but that is neither translation, nor exegesis, but arbitrary comment, not a whit inferior to the interpolations of the Vulgate before noticed.   Except *wormes*, "body," "for me," and "though," duly italicized in the Genevan, are also printed in the letter of the text.

Thus, then, stood the passage in the *most* popular, and *least* popular versions until the Authorized Version of 1611, presented it in the form which still prevails:

"For I know *that* my Redeemer liveth, and *that* he shall stand at the latter *day* upon the earth: ‖"And *though* after my skin, *wormes* destroy this *body*, yet in my flesh shall I see God: Whom I shal see for my selfe, and mine eyes shall behold, and not †another, *though* my reins be consumed ‡within me."

The changes introduced by King James's translators are, first, the cancelling of "he shal rayse vp" and "them that lye in the dust," and "the" before *worms*, in the Bishops'; secondly, the adoption of "he shall stand" (Genevan) with "that" prefixed, combined with "at [*in*— Coverdale] the latter day" (Coverdale), and "upon (*on* G.) the earth" (Genevan); thirdly, the transposition of "yet shal I se God in my flesh" (Genevan) into "yet in my flesh shall I see God," and of "whom I my self shall se" into "whom I shall see for myself;" fourthly, the correction of "none other *for me*" (Genevan, Bishops') into "not another," and substitution of "be" for "are" (Genevan); and, lastly, the italicizing of all supplied words. Of these, "whom I shall see *for* myself" as bringing out the force of לִי, and "not another" as a rendering of וְלֹא־זָר, indicate advanced scholarship, or more correctly, conservative scholarship, in a due appreciation of the force of the original and its treatment by the most approved translators ancient, and contemporary to them.

There are still several remarkable renderings of the passage, which seem to be in place here.

1. The Spanish version of USQUE, 1553:

"Yo conozco mi redemidor bivo, y postrero sobre polvo se leuantará.— Y tras mi cuero tajaron esta, y de mi carne vere Dio.—El qual yo vere por mi, y mis ojos vieron e no estraño, atemaronse mis riñones en mi seno."

‖ *Or*, after I shall awake, though this *body* be destroyed, yet out of my flesh shall I see God.

† *Heb.* a stranger.

‡ *Heb.* in my bosome.

2.   The Spanish version of CASSIODORO DE REYNA, Basel 1569–1622:

" Yo se que mi Redemptor bue, y à la fin me leuantaré sobre el poluo.—Y despues, desde este mi roto cuero y desde mi propria carne tengo de ver à Dios.—Al quál yo tengo de ver por mi, y mis ojos lo han de ver, y no otro, [aunque] mis riñones se consumen dentro de mi."

3.   The version of TREMELLIUS, 1579:

" Equidem ego novi redemptorem meum vivere: & posteriorem super pulverem resurrecturum:—Et postquam *vermes* confoderint istud, evigilante me: tum carne mea me visurum esse Deum.—*Idem* qui sum, ac non alienus visurus sum mihi, & oculi mei aspecturi: *tamen* consumuntur renes mei in sinu meo."

4.   The version of COCCEIUS, *Op*. xl. 191:

" Ego enim novi quod Redemtor meus vivit; et ultimus super pulverem stabit.—Et postquam cutim meam destrinxerint hæc, ibi etiam ex carne mea videbo Deum.—Quem egomet videbo mihi: et oculi mei spectabunt, non *inquam*, alius; conficiuntur renes mei in sinu meo."

5.   The version of DIODATI, Geneva, 1607:

" Ora, quant' è a me, io so che il mio Redentore vive, e che nell' ultimo *giorno* egli si leverà sopra la polvere;—e *quantunque* dopo la mia pelle, questo *corpo* sia roso, pur vedrò con la carne mia Iddio;—il quale io vedrò, gli occhi miei *lo* vedranno, e non un altro; le mie reni mi si consumano in seno."

The examination of the passage through so many versions has necessarily involved the demonstration of numerous renderings not in agreement with the original; it is therefore deemed unnecessary to discuss at length the reasons for the subjoined rendering which seeks to dispense with interpretative supplied matter, as far as practicable, and lays claim only to fidelity to the Hebrew; originality is entirely out of the question, and elegance of diction as well as the finer shades of idiomatic expression are better supplied by a concert of competent judges, than by any individual translator.

TRANSLATION.

25. " Yea I know that my Redeemer liveth, and *that* he will stand *the* Last upon the earth, 26. and *though* after my skin, *even* this be broken, yet from my flesh shall I see God,   27. Whom I, *even* I, shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not a stranger.   My reins faint away in my bosom."

This rendering is submitted on the following grounds:

v. 25.   וַאֲנִי may be either *and*, or, *as for me, yea*; *for*, seems out of place.   יָדַע followed by a finite verb without כִּי occurs Job. xxx. 23; Ps. ix. 17.

חָי alive, living, and predicated of

גֹּאֲלִי might, perhaps, be expressed in *orat. dir.* so as to read "my Redeemer lives;" there seems to be no grammatical reason against making וַאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי govern יָאֲחֲרִין the ו connecting it with הָי and affirming both of גֹּאֲלִי;—אֲחֲרִין may be taken as a substantive, or as an adjective with substantive power, either in apposition with גֹּאֲלִי the subject of the first clause, or as the independent subject of the second clause; perhaps it might be rendered without supplying *the*; the adverbial renderings *at last, hereafter, at*, or *in the latter day* appear to be more or less arbitrary, for in such phrases as *at first* and *at last*, even where the reference is to the subject, we have the forms: בָּרִשֹׁנָה, לָאֲחֲרֹנָה, בָּאֲחֲרֹנָה, *e. g.*, Numb. ii. 31: x. 13; 1 Sam. xxix. ii.; Dan. viii. 3, etc.

יָקוּם עַל־עָפָר, see Ps. xii. 6; Is. xxx. 10, appears to make good sense, if the arising, or standing up, be understood of Job's deliverance. עַל־עָפָר, Zöckler says, denotes *indisputably* the dust of Job's decayed body; this may fairly be questioned, for while in ch. xvii. 16, xx. 11 and xxi. 26 the phrase signifies *the grave*, in xli. 25 it denotes *the earth* without any reference to the grave, also in xxii. 24, and in xxxix. 14 it means *sand*.

v. 26. הָאֵר, a preposition, not a conjunction; if a conjunction, the verb would follow it immediately, cf. xlii. 7; Lev. xiv. 43; it goes therefore with the noun, not with the verb.

נִקְּפוּ, closely connected with זֹּית, might be rendered impersonally; the position of עֹרִי between the preposition and נִקְּפוּ־זֹּית renders the clause an uncommonly difficult one for translation; the literal rendering, of course, is easy enough, viz., "and after my skin—it shall have been broken (or some other word)—this." But such a rendering seems too vague in English; its ruggedness would require too much explanation; "this my skin" (*Ewald, Del.* and *Revised Bible*) appears objectionable, for *this* may mean that which is under the skin, *i. e.*, the whole frame, (*Tayler Lewis*), and *this my skin* would limit the reference to the skin; on the whole, therefore, the reproduction of the abrupt but pregnant זֹּית may be desirable.

וּמִבְּשָׂרִי, the ו admits of being rendered "yet," if "though" is supplied, otherwise *even* may be better than *and*.

מִן if privative, denotes *free from, separate from, without*, not *without* as opposed to *within*, but as not having it, cf. xi. 15, xxi. 9; but *from* seems to be the least interpretative rendering, and preserves the ambiguity of the original.

v. 27. אֲשֶׁר relates to אֵלִיהֶ, while לֹ denotes benefit. The whole clause is emphatic, as is evident from אֲנִי and לֹ, and in order to bring

out the full sense, a rendering stronger than the simple relative might be desirable, perhaps, *even* I, may suffice.

זָר has been rendered a stranger, *alienum*, although a good meaning may be had by translating *alienus*. Taking it as accusative is grammatically correct, and understanding it with Gesenius, Umbreit, Vaihinger, Stickel, Hahn, v. Hoffman and Tayler Lewis (q. v.) in the sense of *adversarius*, appears to me far better than the flat, tautological *alius*. As to the meaning *enemy*, that also seems to be well established by reference to Ps. liv. 5; Is. i. 7: xxix. 5; Ez. xi. 9: xxviii. 10: xxx. 12; Hos. vii. 9; viii. 7; Obad. 11; compare also Job. xvi. 9.

כָּלוּ is rendered *faint away*, with reference to the use of that word in the Authorized Version at Ps. lxxxiv. 3: cxix. 81.

II. Summary of an interpretation of the passage.

I cannot resist the conviction that the passage is decidedly eschatological, and stands out in solitary grandeur as an ancient prophecy, or poetic vision of *a* resurrection. Careful study of the passage, in its true connection, the solemnity of its announcement, the abrupt ruggedness of its enunciation, the fiery rapture of its anticipated fulfilment, and the general sense of its meaning in ancient and modern times, combine to necessitate this view. It is unnecessary to transcribe here the history of the interpretation, a very full account of which is given in Lange's Commentary, *Am. Ed.* An outline of the ideas intended to to be conveyed by the translation submitted may suffice.

1. Job felt himself irresistibly impelled to utter something so wonderful, so unheard-of, so momentous, that he desired it to be put on imperishable record in a roll, and as that might be destroyed, engraved upon the rock.

2. It is the announcement of a Redeemer, concerning whom he affirms that he is his Redeemer, his Goel, Avenger, Judge and Saviour, perhaps the Hero-Messiah, whom he conceives to be eternal, and therefore the survivor of earthly vicissitude and mundane destruction—come what may, let universal ruin prevail, He the great Goel is alive for evermore, and will stand upon the dust or the earth, whether that dust be only Job's, or the dust of all whose bodies have returned to earth.

3. His skin may waste away, the whole bodily organism may be destroyed by disease, death, and decomposition, it will not hurt him, for he is certain of the beatific vision, in a conscious state, of his God, in the body, or out of the body; he shall see God; be his *body* glorified, or his *soul* disembodied, the *vision* is certain, *from* the body as a position, he looking out, or *without* a body, without flesh, in some marvellous manner he will still *see* God, and his *eyes* will behold Him, not as an Avenger, not as a stranger, not as an enemy, but as his friend, the omnipotence of the Mighty God arrayed on his side. And for the consummation and ultimate enjoyment of that blissful estate he yearns with

a longing so intense, he is so carried away, that language seems to fail him, and he is almost ready to faint and die.

These are the ideas which, I believe, lie *in* the passage, and which its true exegesis cannot ignore; concerning those that have been *carried into* it, or *made out of* it, I do not feel called upon to express an opinion. The positions taken appear to me to be sustained by weighty authority, and while I cannot admit that the passage proves the *Christian* doctrine of the Resurrection, it is certainly the proclamation of *a* resurrection, and even the most divergent renderings of the original,—no matter how disguised, weakened, distorted and perverted,—bear their testimony to that. Thus much is certain.

NOTE.—I wish to call attention to the remarkable targumistic addition to the book of Job in the LXX.: γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστή-σεσθαι μεθ᾽ ὧν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησιν. It is, of course, the interpolation of some diaskenast, drawn from a Syriac version of the LXX. (see Böhl, *Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel zur Zeit Jesu*, etc. Wien, 1873. p. 129 sq.), but of dogmatic interest, for it reflects a very ancient view of this remarkable passage.

<div align="right">THE AUTHOR.</div>

An Examination of the Use of the Tenses in Conditional Sentences in Hebrew.

BY REV. H. FERGUSON.

A conditional sentence may be defined as a compound sentence in which the second clause is so limited by the first as to be necessarily dependent upon it, while it, in its turn, is equally necessary as explaining and completing the sense of the first clause.

The First Clause or *Protasis* may express

> Either a *pure condition*, *i. e.*, "if I come;"
> or a *temporal limitation*, *i. e.*, "when I come;"
> or a *causal limitation*, *i. e.*, "since I am coming;"
> or a *concession*, *i. e.*, "though I come."

This statement, though true in any language, is most evidently so in Hebrew: as the language uses the same particles indifferently to express any of these relations; accordingly, in this paper, temporal, causal and concessive clauses will be considered simply as forms of conditions.

My intention in this paper is to give, *first*, a statement of the different expedients made use of by the Hebrew to express a condition and conclusion, without regard to the class of the condition; and, *secondly*, to consider what rules may be gathered for the use of the tenses or other verbal forms in expressing the various classes of conditions.

VARIOUS METHODS USED.

The *Methods* used in the Hebrew writings that have come down to us, to express a Condition and its Conclusion, are as follows:

I.

Without any introductory particle, either (1) *by simple juxtaposition* of the clauses, or (2) *after a relative or interrogative expression*.

II.

With the Condition introduced by *Waw*.

III.

With Condition introduced by a *Conditional Particle:*

    (*a*) by אִם and its compounds,   (*b*) by כִּי,

    (*c*) by אִי,   (*d*) לוּ and its compounds.

A few words as to the results obtained may, perhaps, properly be inserted here, although in anticipation of the examination.

We shall find that, taking all these methods together, the tense which is used most frequently in the *first clause* of a Conditional Sentence is the *Imperfect.*

Next to it in frequency is the simple *Perfect.*

In Conditional Sentences, as in all others, when the verb in either clause is the substantive verb, or may be readily supplied from the context, it is very frequently omitted or its place is supplied by יֵשׁ or אֵין.

In *asseverations,* which in Hebrew are usually expressed by a defective form of the Conditional Sentence (*i. e.,* with second clause omitted by aposiopesis) the *Imperfect* is most commonly used. Out of seventy-seven instances noted, there are fifty-nine cases of the *Imperfect* to eleven of the *Perfect,* and seven in which the verb is not expressed.

Next in frequency to the *Perfect* and *Imperfect* is the use of a *Voluntative* form, either one of the *modal* forms of the *Imperfect* or the *Imperative,* usually, though not always, without an introductory Particle.

A quite common use is that of the *Modified Perfect* (*Perfect* with *Waw conversive*) introducing the condition.

The *Participle* is also frequently found in the first clause, usually after a conditional participle.

Much less frequent is the use of the *Infinitive,* either with an introductory Particle or with a Preposition.

An almost anomalous use is also found, a very few times, of the *Modified Imperfect* introducing a condition.

To analyze results still further, we shall find that in Class I. (without any Introductory Particle whatever) the *Perfect* is the most common form; next to it the *Voluntative* forms; then the *Imperfect;* much more rarely the *Participle* and the *Infinitive.*

In Class II. (with כִּי), which may indeed be considered to differ but little in theory from Class I., but which is put as a separate class for convenience of examination, the *Modified Perfect* is the most common form. The simple *Perfect* would stand next to it, and next to that the simple *Imperfect.* Rarer forms are the *Modified Perfect, Voluntative,* and *Participle.*

In Class III. (with an introductory Particle) the *Imperfect* is by far the most common form in use in the first clause. Next in frequency is the *Perfect.* (As has been mentioned above, the substantive verb is very frequently omitted, or its place supplied by יֵשׁ or אֵין. This is especially the case in this class.)

NOTE.—As in some of the instances cited below, the *logical* Protasis may seem to be, according to grammatical form, the *conclusion* instead of the *condition*, it is well to note that this, if it ever occurs, is due to the peculiar genius of the Hebrew language and its great capacity for inversion. Still, for grammatical purposes, the clause which limits and conditions the other clause, whether put first or last, must be considered as the Protasis of the conditional sentence, as it presented itself to the Hebrew mind.

CLASS I. Sentences without any Introductory Particle. (1) Simple juxtaposition of the clauses. We may have

1. The *Perfect* in the *Protasis* followed in the *Apodosis* by:

   a. The *Perfect;*

   e. g., Prov. xviii. 22: מָצָא אִשָּׁה מָצָא טֹוב   " He finds a wife, he finds good."

   b. By the *Imperfect;*

   e. g., 2 *Kings* v. 13: דִּבֶּר . . הֲלֹא תַעֲשֶׂה   " Had the prophet said some great thing unto thee, wouldst thou not have done it?"

   c. By a *Voluntative* (*Jussive* or *Imperative*);

   e. g., Prov. xxv. 16: דְּבַשׁ מָצָאתָ אֱכֹל דַּיֶּךָ   " If thou hast found honey, eat (only) enough for thee."

   d. By an *Imperfect with Waw Conversive;*

   e. g., Prov. xi. 2: בָּא זָדֹון וַיָּבֹא קָלֹון   " If (or when) pride cometh, then cometh shame."

   e. Or the verb in the *Apodosis* may be understood and not expressed;

   e. g., Lev. xv. 3: רָר . . אֹו־הֶחְתִּים . . טֻמְאָתֹו הִיא   " Whether his flesh run with his issue, or whether his flesh be stopped with his issue, it is his uncleanness."

2. The *Imperfect* in the *Protasis*, followed by:

   a. *Imperfect;*

   e. g., Ex. xv. 7: תְּשַׁלַּח . . יֹאכְלֵמֹו   " When thou sentest forth thy wrath, it consumed them like stubble."

   See also Ps. civ. 28: תִּתֵּן . . יִלְקֹטוּן תִּפְתַּח . . יִשְׂבְּעוּן טֹוב   " When thou givest them they gather it, when thou openest thy hand they are filled with good." So vv. 29 and 30.

   b. By the *Perfect with Waw;*

   e. g., Ex. xxxiii. 5: אֶעֱלֶה . . יְכִלִּיתִיךָ   " If I should come in thy midst but for one moment I should consume thee." Also, 1 *Kings* xviii. 12: וְהָיָה אֲנִי אֵלֵךְ מֵאִתָּךְ   " And when I go away from thee, it will come to pass."

   c. By the *Imperative;*

   e. g., Ps. xxvii. 7: שְׁמַע־יְהֹוָה קֹולִי אֶקְרָא   " Hear my voice O Lord when I cry."

3. *Voluntative* in *Protasis*, followed by:

   a. An *Imperfect;*

      e. g., Ps. cxxxix. 9, 10: . . תַנְחֵנִי יְרֹאחֲזֵנִי . . אֶשְׂכְּנָה . . אֶשָּׂא

      "If I take (Let me take) the wings of the morning, and dwell in
      the uttermost parts of the sea; even there also shall thy hand
      lead me and thy right hand shall hold me."—cf. *Gen.* xlii. 37.

   b. By a *Perfect;*

      e. g., Psalm xl. 6: עָצְמוּ מִסַּפֵּר וַאֲדַבֵּרָה אַגִּידָה　"If I declare
      them (Let me declare them) and speak of them, they are more
      than can be numbered."

      Isa xxvi. 10: . . בַּל־לָמַד . . יֻחַן　"Let favour be shown to
      the wicked, (*though favour be shown to the wicked*) he will not
      learn righteousness."

   c. Or by another *Voluntative;*

      e. g., Psalm. lxviii. 2: . . יָפוּצוּ . . יָקוּם　"Let God arise,
      and let his enemies be scattered." *If God arises, his enemies
      shall be scattered."* 2 *Kings* v. 13: רְחַץ וּטְהָר:　"Wash and
      be clean."

4. *Participle* in *Protasis* followed in the *Apodosis* by:

   a. The *Imperfect:*

      e. g., 2 *Kings* vii. 2 (also 19): . . הֲיִהְיֶה . . עֹשֶׂה יְהוָֹה הִנֵּה
      "Behold, if the Lord opens windows in heaven, shall this thing
      be ?"

   b. The *Perfect* in the Apodosis;

      e. g., Prov. xiv. 31: . . וּמְכַבְּדוֹ חֹנֵן . . חֵרֵף . . עֹשֵׁק
      "He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his Maker; but he
      who honoureth Him pitieth the needy." So also xvii. 5, xix. 17.

   c. The *Imperfect* with *Waw Conv.;*

      e. g., 2 *Kings* vi. 5: מַפִּיל הַקּוֹרָה הָאֶחָד וַיְהִי　"And when
      one was felling wood, it happened," &c.

5. *Infinitive* with Preposition in the *Protasis,* followed by:

   a. The *Imperfect;*

      e. g., Psalm iv. 4: . . יִשְׁמַע בְּקָרְאִי . . .　"The Lord will
      hear me, when I cry unto Him."

(2) Instead of the simple juxtaposition of the clauses, we may have in
the *Protasis,* a Relative, Indefinite, or Interrogative expression, which
indicates its conditional character.

Thus we may have after such expressions as כִּי, הִנֵּה עַתָּה, הִנֵּה,
מָה, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר, מַה־שֶּׁ, (but with far less variability than under (1)
since we find only three tense forms in the *Protasis,* and those with less
variation in the *Apodosis*).

1. A *Perfect* in the *first clause* followed in the *Apodosis* by:

    a. A *Perfect;*

      e. g., Eccl. vi. 10: . . נִקְרָא . . . מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה   "Whatever hath been hath been named already."

    b. Or an *Imperfect;*

      e. g., Hosea ix. 6: תְּקַבְּרֵם . . תְּקַבְּצֵם . . . כִּי־הִנֵּה הָלְכוּ "For, behold they have gone away from destruction! Mizraim shall gather them. Noph shall bury them."

    c. Or a *Jussive;*

      e. g., Judg. vii. 3: יָשֹׁב וְחָרֵד יָרֵא מִי "Whoso is fearful and afraid let him return," &c.

    d. Or a *Participle;*

      e. g., 1 *Sam.* i. 28: . . שָׁאוּל . . הָיָה אֲשֶׁר כָּל־הַיָּמִים "All the days that he liveth he shall be lent unto the Lord."

Or instead of the *Perfect* in the first clause, we may have:

2. An *Imperfect* followed by:

    a. Another *Imperfect* or *Modified Perfect*

      e. g., Num. xxiii. 3: וְהִגַּדְתִּי יַרְאֵנִי מַה־ "And the word that He shall show unto me I will tell thee."

3. Or a *Participle* in the *Protasis* followed by:

    a. A *Modified Perfect* (with Waw Conv.);

      e. g., 2 *Sam.* xvii. 9: וְהָיָה · · · · · · הִנֵּה עַתָּה הוּא־נֶחְבָּא "Behold, he is hid in some pit or in some other place, and it will come to pass," &c. Here the verb might in form be *Niphal Perfect*, but from the use of the הוּא it is best to consider it a *Participle.*

CLASS II. Condition introduced by *Waw.*

Besides continuing conditions already introduced in some other manner, *Waw* is used independently with almost the force of a conditional particle, and may introduce sentences having in the *Protasis*, 1. the *Perfect*, 2. the Modified *Imperfect*, 3. the Simple *Imperfect*, 4. the Modified *Perfect*, 5. the *Voluntative;* thus giving much greater variety in *Protasis* than in Class I., but with less corresponding variation in the *Apodosis.*

1. With *Perfect* in the *Protasis*, followed by:

    a. Another *Perfect;*

      e. g., Ex. xvi. 22: וְנָמָס הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ יָחַם "And when the sun waxed hot, it melted."

This is a very unusual construction, but *Gen.* xxxiii. 13, xlii. 38,

xliv. 22 may be best considered under this head, though the *Perfects* in them may be modified by the Waw.

    b. Or by an *Imperfect:*

        e. g., *Lev.* x. 19: . . . הַיִּיטַב . . . יָאָבַלְתִּי   "For if I had eaten to-day the sin offering, would it have been good in the eyes of the Lord?"

    c. Or by a *Modified Perfect;*

        e. g., *Ruth* ii. 9: . . . צָמִת וְהָלַכְתְּ   "And if thou thirstest, thou shalt go to the vessels."

  2. *Modified Imperfect* in *Protasis* is followed in the *Apodosis* by:

    a. The *Perfect;*

        e. g., 1 *Sam.* ii. 16: לֹא יֹאמַר . . . . . וַיֹּאמֶר   "And if the man said unto him, &c., then he would say," &c.

    b. The *Modified Imperfect;*

        e. g., *Psalm* cvii. 25: · · יַּעֲמֵד יֹּאמֶר   " He spake, then rose the stormy wind.

    c. The *Participle;*

        e. g., *Ex.* iv. 23: . . הֹרֵג אָנֹבִי . . מָאֵן יְתָּ   "And if thou refuse to let him go, behold I will slay thy son."

  3. With *Imperfect* in *Protasis*, followed in the *Apodosis* by:

    a. Another *Imperfect;*

        e. g., *Ezek.* xvi. 55: וּבְנֹתַיִךְ אַתְּ . . תָּשֹׁבְןָ . . אֲחוֹתַיִךְ תְּשֻׁבֶינָה . . "When thy sisters, Sodom and her daughters, shall return to their place, and when Samaria and her daughters return to their place, then thou and thy daughters shalt return to your place."

    b. By a *Voluntative;*

        e. g., *Ps.* lxxvii. 4[b]: רוּחִי יִתְעַטֵּף אָשִׂיחָה   " When my spirit is overwhelmed I will complain."

    c. By a *Modified Perfect;*

        e. g., *Deut.* xxx. 8, 9: . . יְהֹוָתִיךְ · · וְשָׁמַעְתָּ תָשׁוּב אַתָּה   "If thou shalt return and obey the voice of the Lord . . . . . then the Lord thy God shall make thee plenteous," &c.

    d. By a *a second clause in which the verb is understood;*

        e. g., *Ps.* cxxxix. 11: בַּעֲדֵנִי אַךְ יְלַיְלָה . . וָאֹמַר   " If I say, surely darkness shall cover me, then the night is light about me."

  4. The *Modified Perfect* in *Protasis*.

This is of the most common occurrence of all forms of conditional sentences with Waw.   We may have in the *Apodosis* either:

    a. Another *Modified Perfect*, which is the usual construction.

        e. g., Gen. xliv. 29: וְלָקַחְתֶּם . . יְהִי־קָרָהוּ "And if ye take this one also, and mischief befall him, then shall ye bring down my grey hairs in sorrow to the grave."

    b. An *Imperfect;*

        e. g., Neh. i. 9: וְשַׁבְתֶּם . . וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם . . אֲקַבְּצֵם "But if ye return to me, and keep my commandments though, &c. . . yet from thence will I gather them."

  5. The *Voluntative in Protasis:*

    a. Verb omitted in second clause;

        e. g., Ps. cxxxix. 8b: וְאַצִּיעָה שְּׁאוֹל הִנֶּךָּ: "If I make Sheol my bed, behold Thee!"

The verb in the *Protasis* is sometimes omitted, or instead of it we find יֵשׁ or אֵין. In the *Apodosis* we may have:

    a. An *Imperfect;*

        e. g., Amos iii. 4: וְטֶרֶף אֵין לוֹ . . הֲיִשְׁאַג "Will a lion roar in the forest if he have no prey?"

    b. A *Jussive;*

        e. g., Prov. iii. 28: יֵשׁ אִתָּךְ . . אַל־תֹּאמַר "Say not to thy neighbor, go and come again and to-morrow I will give, if thou hast it with thee."

        e. g.. 2 Sam. xiii. 26: יֵלֶךְ־נָא וְלֹא . . . "And Absalom said, 'If not, let Amnon, my brother, come with us.'"*

    c. A *Perfect;*

        e. g., Jud. vi. 13: מְצָאַתְנוּ . . . יֵשׁ "If the Lord be with us why hath all this come upon us?"

CLASS III. More commonly, however, conditional sentences are introduced by special particles אִם, כִּי, אוֹ אִי, לוּ and its compound לוּלֵי or לוּלֵא, and אֵלּוּ. Of these particles, אִם, כִּי and אִי may introduce any kind of condition, לוּ and its compounds are used when the condition is viewed as impossible or as contrary to reality.

There is great diversity in the use of tenses after these particles, although the vast majority of instances fall under only a few heads. The *Imperfect* is the favorite tense in the *Protasis*; and the *Modified Perfect* (Relatively progressive Perfect, *bezuglich fortschreitendes Perfectum*), the favorite tense in the *Apodosis* when the supposition is a simple one.

---

*A better reading in this passage would be וְלֵא "And would that now my brother Amnon," &c.

The *Perfect* is, however, frequently found in the *Protasis* in cases where it is difficult at first sight to detect any reason for prefering it to the *Imperfect;* usually, however, it refers to the completion of the condition either in past time or in future time viewed as past from the standpoint of the second clause.

The use of the *Perfect* in *Protasis* is much more common after אִם than after כִּי, and is the most common use after לוּ and its compounds.

The *Infinitive construct* is also found in the *Protasis* after אִם, in simple suppositions, and may be followed in the *Apodosis* by either Perfect or Imperfect as required. *This use, however, is very rare.*

The *Participle* is found in the *Protasis* several times after אִם, כִּי, and לוּ. It is most frequently followed in the *Apodosis* by the *Voluntative* (*Jussive* or *Imperative*), but also by *Imperfect* with וְ, *Imperfect,* or by another *Participle.*

In asseverations אִם and אִם לֹא are used, with the respective significations of *surely not* and *surely,* with an ellipsis of second clause, which may be supplied as "God do so to me and more also," or other form of imprecation. This second clause is sometimes expressed.

In this use the *Imperfect* most commonly occurs, but also the *Perfect* several times, and in several instances the verb is omitted, or its place supplied by יֵשׁ or אַיִן.

Often the verb in the *Protasis* has to be understood. Its place is sometimes supplied, as above mentioned, by יֵשׁ or אַיִן, but frequently it is simply omitted. With this use in the *Protasis*, the *Apodosis* most commonly will have either an *Imperfect* (or *Modified Perfect*) or a *Voluntative* (*Cohortative, Jussive, Imperative.*) The *Perfect* and the *Participle* are, however, also found, (though rarely).

The Compound Particle כִּי אִם presents some difficult constructions. It may frequently be rendered *"but if,"* or *"for if,"* or *"that if,"* or *"unless,"* in all of which cases the conditional character is apparent; but it frequently, also, seems to lose its conditional force, and to become, when used with nouns, a preposition with the meaning of *"except,"* *"save,"* and when used with verbs will have the sense of *"but," "only";* *i. e.,* strongly adversative like the German *"sondern."*

In the first of these cases, when used with nouns, it is only necessary to understand the substantive verb as omitted, or to supply the verb which follows, and the conditional character will be clear, and the force and value of the particle will be apparent; *e. g., Gen.* xxxix. 6: "And he (Potiphar) knew not ought he had save (כִּי־אִם) the bread which he did eat."—This is equal to " he knew not ought he had except (but if) *it were* the bread," &c., or " unless *he knew* the bread."

But when כִּי־אִם appears before a verb, and the conditional charac-
ter is not apparent, it will be necessary to resort to an ellipsis to explain
the use of the particle. Thus we have in *Jer.* vii. 22, 23: "For I
spake not to your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I
brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings
or sacrifices; but (כִּי־אִם) this thing commanded I them," &c. Here
the ellipsis to be supplied will perhaps be "But (if or when) I
gave them any commands, this I commanded them." So also in *Jere-
miah* xvi. 14, 15: "Therefore, behold the days come, saith the Lord,
that it shall no more be said, The Lord liveth that brought up the chil-
dren of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but (כִּי־אִם) The Lord liveth
that brought up," &c. Here also there is evidently an ellipsis to be
supplied; "but if, or when, (anything of the kind is said, it shall be
said) The Lord liveth," &c.

The presence of אִם cannot be purposeless, and the particle, at some
period at least of the history of the language, must have had a sen-
sible value, though it is not necessary to suppose that the Hebrews
were very conscious of any special force at the comparatively late
period in which the books of the Old Testament were written. In
some instances כִּי־אִם can hardly be distinguished from כִּי, *e. g.*, 2 *Sam.*
xv. 21, *Prov.* xxiii. 17, *Jer.* xxxi. 30.

CLASS III. First Clause introduced by a Conditional Particle (אִם,
[אִלּוּ, לוּלֵי] לוּ, אִי, כִּי, כִּי־אִם)

  a. When introduced by אִם

  1. We have most commonly the *Imperfect* in the *Protasis* followed
by:

  a. The *Modified Perfect;*

    e. g., Gen. xviii. 26: אִם אֶמְצָא · · וְנָשָׂאתִי   "If I find fifty
    righteous men in Sodom, I will spare the whole place for their
    sake."

So most frequently, when the verb is the first word in the second
clause. When any other word intervenes, we have

  b. The *Imperfect;*

    e. g., Gen. xviii. 28, *et passim:* לֹא אַשְׁחִית אִם אֶמְצָא   "I will
    not destroy it if I find forty and five."

  c. The *Perfect* may also stand in the second clause, though rarely
found:

    e. g., Ps. cxxvii. 1: · · · · · · אִם · · לֹא יִבְנֶה · · עָמְלוּ
    אִם · · לֹא יִשְׁמָר־ · · שָׁקֵד   "Except the Lord build the
    house, the builders of it will have labored in vain upon it. Ex-
    cept the Lord keep the city, the watchman will have watched in
    vain."

    d. Very rarely the *Modified Imperfect;*

      e. g., Ps. lix. 16ᵇ: אִם־לֹא יִשְׂבְּעוּ וַיָּלִינוּ "If they be not satis-fied, they remain all night."

    e. Frequently a *Voluntative* (*Cohortative, Jussive* or *Imperative*)*;*

      e. g., Ps. cxxxvii. 5: תִּשְׁכַּח · · אִם־אֶשְׁכָּחֵךְ "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning." So also v. 6, and frequently.

Here the verb is *Jussive;* for *Imperative*, which is a rarer con-struction, *vide Job.* xxxiii. 5: אִם־תּוּכַל הֲשִׁיבֵנִי עֶרְכָה לְפָנַי הִתְיַצָּבָה "If thou art able to answer me, set (thy words) in order before me, stand up." (Here also belong *second clauses* with הֲלִילָה).

    f. With *Participle* in the *second clause* (*rare*);

      e. g., Jer. ii. 22 : נִכְתָּם · · כִּי אִם־תְּכַבְּסִי "For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much sope, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God."

    g. Without any verb expressed in *second clause;*

      e. g., Ps. cxxxix. 8: אִם־אֶסַּק שָׁמַיִם שָׁם אָתָּה "If I ascend up to heaven, Thou art there." So also, though not so fre-quently, with יֵשׁ or אֵין *e. g., Is.* viii. 20: · · אִם־לֹא יֹאמְרוּ אֲשֶׁר אֵין לוֹ "To the law and the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, they are of those for whom is no morn-ing."

    h. With *second clause* omitted by *Aposiopesis;*

      e. g., Ex. xxxii. 32ᵃ: וְעַתָּה אִם־תִּשָּׂא "And now, if Thou wilt forgive their sins——."

  2. *Perfect* in the *Protasis :*

    a. With *Perfect* or *Modified Imperfect* in the *second clause* (*rare*)*;*

      e. g., Ps. lxxiii. 15. *Perfect:* אִם אָמַרְתִּי · · בָגָדְתִּי "If I had said, 'I will speak thus,' behold I should have offended against the generation of thy children."

       Ps. l. 18. *Modified Imperfect:* אִם־רָאִיתָ · · וַתֵּרֶץ "When thou sawest a thief, then consentedst thou with him."

    b. With *Modified Perfect* or *Imperfect* in *second clause;*

      e. g., Deut. xxi. 14. *Modified Perfect:* חָפַצְתָּ · · וְהָיָה אִם־לֹא וְשִׁלַּחְתָּהּ "And it shall come to pass, if thou hast no delight in her, that thou shalt send her away," &c.

      Num. xxxii. 17. *Imperfect.* עַד אֲשֶׁר · · · וַאֲנַחְנוּ נֵחָלֵץ · · אִם־הֲבִיאֹנֻם "But we will go armed before the children of Israel, until we have brought them to their place."

    c. With *Voluntative* (*Jussive and Imperative*) in *second clause;*

      e. g., *Gen.* xviii. 3. *Jussive:* אִם־נָא מָצָאתִי · · אַל־נָא תַעֲבֹר

"If now I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away from
thy servant." *Gen.* l. 4., *Imperative.* . . אִם־נָא מָצָאתִי שִׂים־נָא

"If now I have found favor in thy sight, place now thy hand,"
&c.

    d. Without any verb expressed in *second clause;*

      e. g., *Prov.* xxx. 32. *Verb omitted:* אִם־נָבַלְתָּ · · וְאִם־זַמּוֹתָ יָד

לְפֶה: "If thou hast done foolishly in lifting up thyself, or if
thou hast thought evil, (lay) thy hand upon thy mouth."
Prov. xxiv. 14[b]: (אִם מָצָאתָ וְיֵשׁ) "When thou hast found
it, then is there a reward."

    e. Second clause omitted by *Aposiopesis;*

      e. g., *Gen.* xxx. 27:   אִם־נָא מָצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ   "If now I have
found favour in thy sight" ("do as I request," understood).

  3.   With *Infinitive* in the *Protasis* (*rare*):

    a. With *Perfect* in second clause;

      e. g., *Job.* ix. 27, 28: · · אִם־אָמְרִי יָגֹרְתִּי · · יָדַעְתִּי   "If I
say, I will forget my sorrows, I will leave off my complaints and ·
comfort myself; I am afraid of all my sorrows: I know that thou
wilt not hold me innocent." *v.* Ewald (*Ausführl. Lehrbuch*) p.
859.

    b. With *Imperfect* in *second clause;*

      e. g.,, 2 *Sam.* iii. 13: הֲבִיאֲךָ · · כִּי אִם · · לֹא תִרְאֶה   "Thou
shalt not see my face unless thou bringest back Michal the
the daughter of Saul."

  4.   With *Participle* in *Protasis:*

    a. With *Imperfect* in *second clause;*

      e. g., *Judg.* xi. 9: · · · אָנֹכִי אֶהְיֶה · · אִם־מְשִׁיבִים אַתֶּם

"If ye bring me back to fight with the children of Ammon * *
shall I be your head?"

    b. With *Voluntative* in *second clause;*

      e. g., *Job.* xxxi. 9, 10: *Jussive.* . . תִּטְחַן · · אִם נִפְתָּה

"If my heart hath gone aside after a woman . . . then let
my wife grind for another."

      Num. xi. 15: *Imperative.* . . הָרְגֵנִי נָא · · וְאִם־כָּכָה אַתְּ־עֹשֶׂה

הָרֹג נָא־ נִי הָרְגֵ   "If thus Thou art about to do to me, slay
me, I pray thee, at once."

    c. With *Participle* in *second clause* (*rare*);

e. g., *Jer.* xxvi. 15: אִם־מְמִתִים אַתֶּם · · אַתֶּם נֹתְנִים "But know ye for certain, that if ye put me to death, ye shall be bringing innocent blood upon yourselves, and upon this city," &c.

5. In *Asseverations*, where the *second clause* is understood, we find:

a. With *Imperfect* in *Protasis* (*frequent*);

e. g., *Gen.* xiv. 23: (אִם=*not*) · · וְאִם־אֶקַּח · · אִם־מִחוּט "I will not (take) from a thread to a shoe latchet, and I will not take of anything that is thine."

e. g., *Gen.* xxiv. 38: (אִם־לֹא=*surely*) תֵלֵךְ · · אִם־לֹא "Thou shalt surely go to my father's house and my tribe."

b. With *Perfect* in *Protasis* (*not so common*);

e. g., 1 *Sam.* xvii. 55: (אִם=*not*) אִם־יָדַעְתִּי: "And Abner said, May thy soul live, O King, I do not know."=*present*.

e. g., *Jer.* xv. 11: (אִם־לֹא=*surely*) הִפְגַּעְתִּי אִם־לֹא "The Lord said, 'Verily, it shall be well with thy remnant; verily, I will cause the enemy to treat thee well, in the time of evil and in the time of affliction.'"=*future*.

e. g., 2 *Kings* ix. 26: (אִם־לֹא=*surely*) · · רָאִיתִי · · אִם־לֹא יְשִׁלַּמְתָּ "Surely, I have seen yesterday the blood of Naboth and the blood of his sons, saith the Lord; and I will requite thee in this plat, saith the Lord."=*past*.

c. With יֵשׁ in the *Protasis* (*rare*);

e. g., 1 *Kings* xvii. 12: (אִם=*not*) אִם־יֶשׁ־לִי מָעוֹג · · "And she said, 'As the Lord thy God liveth, I have not a cake,'" &c.

6. *Verb* in the *Protasis* omitted:

a. *With* יֵשׁ *or* אֵין *in Protasis*;

(a1) With *Imperfect* in *second clause*;

e. g., 2 *Kings* ii. 10: וְאִם־אַיִן לֹא יִהְיֶה: "but if not, it shall not be."

(a2) With *Modified Perfect* in *second clause*;

e. g., *Gen.* xliv. 26: יָרַדְנוּ · · אִם־יֵשׁ "If our youngest brother be with us, then will we go down."

b. With *Jussive* or *Imperative* in the *second clause*;

e. g., *Judges* ix, 15: וְאִם־אַיִן תֵּצֵא · · וְתֹאכַל "But if not, let fire come forth from the bramble and devour the cedars of Lebanon."

e. g., *Gen.* xxiv. 49: (with *Participle*) וְעַתָּה אִם־יֶשְׁכֶם עֹשִׂים הַגִּידוּ לִי · · "And now if ye are those who will do favour and truth to my master, tell me."

    c. With *Modified Imperfect* (*very rare*);

       e. g., *Job.* xxxiii. 23, 24: . . וַיְחֻנֶּנּוּ וַיֹּאמֶר . . אִם־יֵשׁ "If there be a messenger with him, an interpreter, one of a thousand, to shew unto man his uprightness; then he is gracious unto him and saith, 'Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom.'"

    d. With *Participle* in *second clause* (*rare*);

       e. g., *Gen.* xxx. 1: וְאִם אַיִן מֵתָה אָנֹכִי׃ "And she said to Jacob, Give me my children, or if not I shall die."

  B. Without *any verb* (or יֵשׁ or אַיִן) *in Protasis*:

    a.[1] With *Imperfect* in *second clause*;

       e. g., *Lev.* xxv. 51: *Imperfect*. יָשִׁיב . . אִם־עוֹד "And if there be yet many years, according to them shall he give again the price of his redemption out of the money he was bought for."

    a.[2] *e. g.*, *Lev.* xxvii. 4: *Modified Perfect*. וְאִם נְקֵבָה הִוא וְהָיָה "But if it be a female, then shall thy estimation be thirty shekels."

    b. With *Perfect* in *second clause* (*rare*);

       e. g., *Hosea* xii. 12: אִם־גִּלְעָד אָוֶן . . הָיוּ . . זִבֵּחוּ "If there is (idolatry) iniquity in Gilead, surely they are vanity; they sacrifice bullocks in Gilgal, yea their altars are as heaps in the furrows of the fields." cf. Gen. xxiii. 13; Nahum i. 12.

    c. With *Voluntative* in *second clause*;

       e. g. I *Chron.* xii. 17b: (*Jussive*) . . יֵרֶא . . וְאִם־לְרַמּוֹתַנִי וְיוֹכַח׃ "But if (it be) to betray me to my enemies, seeing there is no wrong in my hands, the God of our fathers look thereon and judge."

       e. g., *Gen.* xliii. 11: (*Imperative.*) אִם־כֵּן אֵפוֹא זֹאת עֲשׂוּ "if it must be so now, do this."

       e. g., *Gen.* xiii. 9: (*Cohortative.*) אִם־הַשְּׂמֹאל וְאֵימִנָה וְאִם־הַיָּמִין וְאַשְׂמְאִילָה׃ "if to the left, then I will go to the right; but if to the right, then I will go the left."

    d. With *Participle* in *second clause*;

       e. g., I *Sam.* xxvi. 19: וְאִם בְּנֵי הָאָדָם אֲרוּרִים הֵם "But if it be the children of men, cursed be they before the Lord."

    e.[1] *Second clause understood*;

       e. g., *Gen.* xlii. 16: כִּי מְרַגְּלִים אַתֶּם . . וְאִם־לֹא— "And if not (*I swear*) as Pharaoh liveth, that ye are spies."

    e.[2] Verb in *second clause* omitted.

e. g., 1 *Sam.* xv. 17: הֲלוֹא אִם־קָטֹן אַתָּה · · רֹאשׁ · · אַתָּה אֱלֶךָ

"And Samuel said, 'When thou wast little in thy sight, wast thou not made head over the tribes of the children of Israel ?'"

C. With *ellipsis* of *first clause* after כִּי אִם

  a. With *Imperfect* in *second clause;*
  e. g., Gen. xv. 4: כִּי־אִם אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ הוּא יִירָשֶׁךָ " This shall not be thine heir, but (if when thou hast an heir) he who springs from thy loins, he shall be thine heir."

  b. With *Perfect* in *second clause;*
  e. g., Jer. vii. 23: כִּי־אִם · · · צִוִּיתִי " But this thing I commanded them, saying."—" But (if I commanded, which I did) this thing I commanded, saying—"

  c. With *Imperative* in *second clause;*
  e. g., Is. lxv. 18: כִּי־אִם־שִׂישׂוּ וְגִילוּ " But (when ye rejoice) rejoice forever in that which I create."

  d. With *Participle* in *second clause;*
  e. g., 2 *Kings* xvii. 40: הֵם עֹשִׂים : · · כִּי־אִם " But they did not hearken, but (whatever they did, they did after their former manner.")

  e. Without any verb *expressed* in the *second clause;*
  e. g., Ps. i. 2: כִּי־אִם בְּתוֹרָה יי חֶפְצוֹ " But (when he takes delight) his delight is in the law of the Lord."

Occasionally we meet with compound conditional sentences which combine two or more of the above mentioned constructions. A striking instance of this is given in *Job.* viii. 4–6, where we have a triple condition with a single conclusion: (1) *Perfect* and *Modified Imperfect*, (2) *Imperfect*, (3) *verb omitted.* Conclusion, *Imperfect.* Cf. also *Job.* xxxi. 16–22, 38–40.

Job. viii. 4–6: אִם · · בָּנֶיךָ חָטְאוּ־לוֹ וַיְשַׁלְּחֵם · · אִם־אַתָּה תְּשַׁחֵר · · אִם־תִּתְחַנָּן · · כִּי עַתָּה יָעִיר · · וְשִׁלַּם " If thy children have sinned against Him, and He have cast them away in the hand of their transgression;"

" If thou wouldst seek unto God betimes, and make thy supplication to the Almighty;"

" If thou wert pure and upright; surely now would He awake for thee, and make the habitation of thy righteousness prosperous."

<div align="center">ב</div>

Condition introduced by כִּי

  I. With *Imperfect* in the *Protasis:*
    *a.*₁ With *Modified Perfect* in *second clause;*

  e. g., *Gen.* xii. 12: וְהָיָה כִּי־יִרְאוּ · · וְאָמְרוּ "And when the Egyptians see thee, it will come to pass that they will say," &c.

 *a.*² With *Imperfect* in *second clause;*

  e. g., *Gen.* iv. 12: · · כִּי תַעֲבֹד · · לֹא־תֹסֵף "When thou tillest the ground, it shall no more yield thee its strength."

 b. With *Perfect* in the *second clause;*

  e. g., *Ps.* xli. 12: · · בְּזֹאת יָדַעְתִּי · · כִּי לֹא־יָרִיעַ "By this I know that thou favourest me when mine enemy doth not triumph against me."

 c. With *Voluntative* in *second clause;*

  e. g., 2 *Kings* xviii. 32: (*Jussive.*) כִּי־יַסִּית · · וְאַל־תִּשְׁמְעוּ

  "Hearken not to Hezekiah when he persuadeth you, saying—."

  e. g., *Is.* xxx. 21: (*Imperative.*) לְכוּ בוֹ כִּי תַאֲמִינוּ וְכִי תַשְׂמְאִילוּ

  "This is the way, walk ye in it, whether ye turn to the right hand or whether ye turn to the left."

 d. With *Participle* in *second clause;*

  e. g., *Zech.* vii. 6: וְכִי תֹאכְלוּ וְכִי תִשְׁתּוּ הֲלוֹא אַתֶּם הָאֹכְלִים

  וְאַתֶּם הַשֹּׁתִים: "And when ye ate and when you drank, were ye not eating, and were ye not drinking," &c.

Perhaps, however, this should be considered as an instance under the next subdivision, of verb omitted in second clause, considering הָאֹכְלִים and הַשֹּׁתִים as predicates.

  e. g., *Jer.* xiv. 12: (*Participle with* אֵין.) כִּי יָצֻמוּ אֵינֶנִּי שֹׁמֵעַ

  אֵינֶנִּי רֹצֶם · · וְכִי יַעֲלוּ "Though they fast, I will not hear their cry, and though they offer burnt offering and oblation I will not accept them."

 e. Without any verb *expressed* in the *second clause;*

  e. g., *Jer.* xii. 1: כִּי אָרִיב · · צַדִּיק אַתָּה "Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee."

  So *Mal.* i. 8: (With אֵין.) אֵין רָע וְכִי תַגִּישׁוּ · · וְכִי־תַגִּישׁוּן

  אֵין רָע "But if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? and if ye offer the lame and the sick, is it not evil?"

 f. *Second clause omitted;*

  e. g., *Is.* xxxvi. 7: הֲלוֹא · · וְכִי תֹאמֵר "But if thou say to me, we trust in the Lord our God, (*I reply*) Is it not He, whose high places, and whose altars, Hezekiah has taken away?"

 2. With *Perfect* in *Protasis:*

  a. With *Perfect* or *Modified Imperfect* in the *second clause;*

e. g., *Ps.* xxxii. 3: *(Perfect.)* . . . כִּי־הֶחֱרַ֫שְׁתִּי בָּל֑וּ   "When I kept silence, my bones waxed old, through my roaring all the day long."

e. g., *Gen.* vi. 1, 2: *(Modified Imperfect.)* וַיִּרְאוּ . . כִּי־הֵחֵל וַיְהִי "And it came to pass, when men began to multiply upon the face of the earth, that (*or* and) daughters were born unto them; and (*or* that) the B'ne Elohim," &c.

b. With *Imperfect* in *second clause;*

e. g., *Is.* xliii. 20: *(Imperfect.)* *(rare).* כִּי־נָתַ֫תִּי . . תְּכַבְּדֵ֫נִי " The beast of the field shall honour me, the dragons and the owls, because (*better* when) I give (=shall have given) waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen."

c. With *Jussive;*

e. g., *Gen.* xlix. 6: *(Jussive.)* . . אַל־תֵּחַד . . אַל־תָּבֹא עֲקְרוּ־שׁוֹר . . הָֽרְגוּ . . כִּי . . "O my soul, come not into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united: because in their anger they slew men, and in their self-will they houghed oxen."   (A. V., "digged down a wall.")

d. Without any verb expressed in *second clause;*

e. g., *Ps.* ciii. 16: כִּי ר֨וּחַ עָֽבְרָה־בּ֥וֹ וְאֵינֶ֗נּוּ   "For as soon as the wind passeth over it, it is not."

e. g., *Ezek.* xiv. 21: שִׁלַּ֫חְתִּי . . אַף כִּי   "Thus saith the Lord God, How much more when I send my four sore judgments upon Jerusalem, the sword and the famine, the noisome beast and the pestilence?"

3.   With *Participle* in *Protasis* (*rare*):

a. With *Perfect* in *second clause* (*rare*);

e. g., *Jer.* xliv. 19: . . וְהַסֵּ֖ךְ . . עָשִׂ֛ינוּ . . מְקַטְּרִ֥ים וְכִֽי־אֲנַ֫חְנוּ "And when we burned incense to the queen of heaven, and poured out drink offerings unto her, did we make her cakes to worship her, and pour out drink offerings unto her, without our men?"

4.   With no verb expressed in *Protasis:*

a. With *Modified Imperfect* in *second clause;*

e. g., *Hos.* xi. 1: כִּ֤י נַ֫עַר יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל וָאֹהֲבֵ֑הוּ   " When Israel was a child, then I loved him."

b. With *Imperfect* in *second clause;*

e. g., *Josh.* xvii. 18: כִּי רֶ֤כֶב בַּרְזֶל֙ ל֔וֹ . . . תּוֹרִ֑ישׁ   " For

thou shalt drive out the Canaanite, because he hath chariots of iron, and because he is strong."

  c. With *Jussive* or *Imperative* in the *second clause;*

       e. g., Prov. xxiii. 22: (*Jussive.*)   וְאַל־תָּבוּז כִּי־זָקְנָה   "And be not ashamed of thy mother when she is old."

This may also be *Perfect*, 3d sing., fem., instead of the adjective.

       e. g., Job. xxxvi. 18: (*Jussive.*)   כִּי־חֵמָה פֶּן־יְסִיתְךָ בְשָׂפֶק

       וְרָב־כֹּפֶר אַל־יַטֶּךָ׃   "If there be anger, lest he turn thee aside by punishment, then let not a great ransom turn thee away."

(A very difficult passage, but perhaps so best translated.)

       e. g., Prov. xix. 18: (*Imperative.*)   יַסֵּר בִּנְךָ כִּי־יֵשׁ תִּקְוָה

    "Chasten thy son, while there is hope."   cf. 1 *Kings* xviii. 27.

<div align="center">ג</div>

Condition introduced by אִי

  1. With *Perfect* in the *Protasis:*

       a. With *Modified Perfect* or *Imperfect* in the *second clause;*

         e. g., Lev. xxv. 49b: אוֹ־הִשִּׂיגָה יָדוֹ וְנִגְאָל׃   "Or if his hand attains to it, then he may redeem himself."

         e. g., Ex. xxi. 36: (*Imperfect.*)   . . אוֹ נוֹדַע . . שַׁלֵּם יְשַׁלֵּם

       "Or if it be known that the ox hath used to push in time past, and his owner hath not kept him in, he shall surely pay ox for ox, and the dead shall be his own."

  2. With *Imperfect* in *Protasis:*

       a. With *Imperfect* in *second clause;*

         e. g., Ezek. xiv. 17, 18:   17, . . . אוֹ חֶרֶב אָבִיא

         18,   . . . לֹא יַצִּילוּ

       "Or if I send a sword upon the land, &c. Though these three men were in it, as I live, saith the Lord, they shall deliver neither sons nor daughters."

<div align="center">ד</div>

Condition introduced by לוּ, or one of its compounds אִלֵּי or לוּלֵי or אִלּוּ

  1. With *Perfect* in the *Protasis:*

       a. With *Imperfect* in *second clause;*

         e. g., Deut. xxxii. 29:   יָבִינוּ . . . לוּ חָכְמוּ יַשְׂכִּילוּ   "If they were wise they would understand this, they would consider their latter end."

With *Second* or *Modified Perfect* in *second clause*:

e. g., *Micah* ii. 11:   לוֹ · · דֹּזֵב · · יְהָיֶה   "If a man walking in the spirit and falsehood do lie, 'I will prophesy unto them of wine and strong drink,' then shall he be the prophet of this people."

b. With *Perfect* or *Modified Imperfect* in the *second clause;*

e. g., *Is.* i. 9: (*Perfect.*) רָמִינוּ · · הָיִינוּ · · הוֹתִיר · · לוּלֵי "If the Lord of Hosts had not left us a small remnant, we should be as Sodom, and should be made like unto Gomorrha."

e. g., *Is.* xlviii. 18: (*Modified Imperfect.*) וַיְהִי · · הִקְשַׁבְתָּ לוּא "If thou hadst hearkened to my commandments, then had thy peace been as a river," &c.

c. Without any verb expressed in the *second clause;*

e. g., 1 *Sam.* xiv. 30: אַף כִּי לוּא אָכֹל אָכַל   "How much more if the people had to-day eaten of the spoil of their enemies that they found."

d. With *second clause* omitted by *Aposiopesis;*

e. g., *Ps.* xxvii. 13: לוּלֵא הֶאֱמַנְתִּי   "If I had not trusted to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living!"

e. g., *Num.* xx. 3: וְלוּ גָוַעְנוּ "And if we had died with our brethren before the Lord——!"=*utinam.*

2.   With *Imperfect* in the *Protasis:*

a. With *Second Perfect* in *second clause;*

e. g., *Gen.* l. 15: וְהָשֵׁב יָשִׁיב · · לוּ יִשְׂטְמֵנוּ "If perchance Joseph should hate us, he will requite to the uttermost to us all the evil which we did unto him."

Perhaps this should be rather rendered as an *Aposiopesis*="If perchance Joseph should hate us, and certainly requite us all the evil we did unto him—!!" but the rendering given is to be preferred.

b. *Second clause* omitted;

e. g., *Gen.* xvii. 18: לוּ יִשְׁמָעֵאל יִחְיֶה לְפָנֶיךָ:   "If only Ish-mael might live in thy presence."

3.   With *Jussive* or *Imperative* in the *Protasis:*

Second clause omitted by *Aposiopesis;*

e. g., *Gen.* xxx. 34: (*Jussive.*)   הֵן לוּ יְהִי כִדְבָרֶךָ   "And Laban said, Behold, if it may be as thou hast said!"=would that it may be as thou hast said.

e. g., *Gen.* xxiii. 13: (*Imperative.*) לוּ שְׁמָעֵנִי   "Would that thou wouldst hear me." " *Oh, hear me.*" "*Only hear me.*"

4. Without any verb in *Protasis;*

   a. With *Perfect* in *second clause;*

      e. g., Num. xxii. 29: כִּי עַתָּה הֲרַגְתִּיךְ . . לוּ יֶשׁ "If only there were a sword in my hand, surely then had I killed thee"; *or* "If only there were a sword in my hand! (*Aposiopesis*) For then had I killed thee."

5. With *Participle* in the *Protasis:*

   a. With *Imperfect* in *second clause;*

      e. g., 2 *Sam.* xviii. 12 (q'ri): לֹא אֶשְׁלַח . . וְלוּ אָנֹכִי שֹׁקֵל "And the man said unto Joab, though I should weigh upon my hand a thousand shekels, I would not put forth my hand against the king's son."

   b. Without any verb expressed in the *second clause;*

      e. g., 2 *Sam.* xix. 7 (q'ri): מֵתִים . . כִּי לוּ אַבְשָׁלוֹם חַי וְכֻלָּנוּ כִּי אָז יָשָׁר "For this day I perceive that if Absalom had lived, and all of us had died, then it would have pleased thee well."

<div align="center">אִלּוּ</div>

This *Particle* is found only in the late books of *Esther* and *Ecclesiastes*, and but only once in each, and is connected with the *Perfect* in both clauses.

      e. g., Esth. vii. 4b: נִמְכַּרְנוּ הֶחֱרַשְׁתִּי . . וְאִלּוּ "And if we had been sold for slaves and bondwomen, I would have kept silence."

<div align="center">אוּלַי</div>

This *Particle* which is usually to be translated "*perchance*," "*peradventure*," is used in *Num.* xxii. 33 with the force of לוּלֵי , which is in in all probability the correct reading (*v.* Ewald—*Lehrbuch* S. 805, N. 2), which has been changed into our present text by a copyist's error. The passage is as follows:

<div align="center">אוּלַי נָטְתָה · · כִּי עַתָּה · · הָרַגְתִּי · · הֶחֱיֵיתִי:</div>

"If she had not turned aside from before me, surely now would I have killed thee and saved her alive."

Examples like *Gen.* xxvii. 12, *Josh.* ix. 7, *Is.* xlvii. 12, *Hosea* viii. 7 belong to Class I., the indirect question supplying the conditional force to the first clause. In *Amos* v. 15, *Jer.* xxi. 2, *Gen.* xvi. 2 no conditional force is apparent.

PART II.

HOW THE DIFFERENT CLASSES OF CONDITIONS ARE EXPRESSED.

From the examples cited and those contained in the tables, we may draw the following conclusions:

That the tenses are used, not arbitrarily, but in accordance with their nature, and always with the proper force.

Hence, if the special force in the condition is upon the verbal idea itself, with no reference to time, the *Imperfect*, or one of its modifications, the *Cohortative*, *Jussive* or *Imperative* will be used.

When the time of the condition is emphasized, if it be *future*, the *Imperfect* is the usual tense; but in Prophetic language, the *Perfect*, according to a well-known rule, may be found in its place.

If *present*, the *Perfect* or *Participle* will be generally used.

If stress be laid in any degree upon the completion of the condition, or of the action expressed by the verb in the conditional clause, the *Perfect* will be used.

There are in Hebrew, as in other languages, four main classes of conditions, to which nearly every example may be referred:

I. The first class assumes the condition to be real and actual.

II. The second class assumes the condition to be probable.

III. The third class makes no assumption in regard to the probability of the condition, and is merely indefinite.

IV. The fourth class views the condition as impossible and as contrary to reality.

These conditions are usually introduced by a conditional particle, such as אִם, כִּי, אִי, לוּ (and its compounds לוּלֵי or לוּלֵא and אִלּוּ), and יְ; sometimes by an interjection, as הֵן, הִנֵּה; or by an interrogative expression, מָה, מִי, or by an indefinite relative, as כָּל־אֲשֶׁר, &c.; or may also simply be expressed by the juxtaposition of the clauses, without or with the copula.

When introduced by a regular conditional particle, we find the following uses of the various tenses and verbal forms:

The *Imperfect*.

This tense is used mainly in conditions when the result is regarded as *probable*, or at least *indefinite*. Thus:

1. If the condition imply *probability*, we shall usually find the *Imperfect* in the *Protasis*, followed by the *Perfect with Waw conversive* in the *Apodosis*, if the verb stand the first word in the clause; but if any words intervene, the *Imperfect* will be used instead. Sometimes, though rarely, the *Imperfect* stands first:

e. g., 2 *Kings* vii. 4b: אִם־יְחַיֻּנוּ נִחְיֶה וְאִם־יְמִיתֻנוּ וָמָתְנוּ:   " If they save us alive, we shall live (*Imperfect*), but if they kill us, we shall die" (*Perfect with Waw*).

2.   So also in all laws and commands we have the same construction:

e. g., Ex. xxii. 7: אִם־לֹא יִמָּצֵא הַגַּנָּב וְנִקְרַב   " If the thief be not found, then shall the master of the house be brought unto Haelohim," &c. (*Modified Perfect.*)

e. g., Ex. xxii. 6: אִם־יִמָּצֵא הַגַּנָּב וְשִׁלֵּם שְׁנָיִם   " If the thief be found, he shall pay double," (*Imperfect*).

3.   When the condition is *probable* or *indefinite*, and the second clause contains a declaration of purpose, we have the same construction:

e. g., Gen. xviii. 26: אִם־אֶמְצָא and וְנָשָׂאתִי   " If I find fifty⋅ righteous men in Sodom, I will spare the whole place for their sake." (*Perfect with Waw.*)

e. g., Gen. xviii. 28: לֹא אַשְׁחִית אִם־אֶמְצָא   " I will not destroy it if I find five and forty there." (*Imperfect.*)

In any of these cases the *Imperfect* may be replaced by a *Voluntative:*

e. g., Job. xxxi. 16–18 (*Jussive*);   *Ps.* xlix. 17 (*Jussive*); *Deut.* xii. 14 (*Imperative*); *Is.* xxi. 12 (*Imperative*); *Hab.* ii. 3b (*Imperative*), *et passim.*

4.   When the hypothesis is *indefinite* and the conclusion merely considered *possible*, or when the supposition is extremely *improbable*, but yet *possible* (Class III.), the *Imperfect* is usually found in both clauses:

e. g., Job. viii. 5, 6: אִם . . תְּשַׁחֵר . . תִּתְחַנָּן . . כִּי עַתָּה יָעִיר עָלֶיךָ

" If thou wouldst seek unto God betimes, and make thy supplication to the Almighty,——surely now he would awake for thee, and make prosperous the dwelling of thy righteousness."   So also xxii. 24, li. 53; *Is.* i. 18, x. 22; *Amos* ix. 2, 3; *Obad.* 4; *Hos.* ix. 12 (*Perfect* with ו); *Ezek.* xviii. 5; *Hab.* i. 5; *Ps.* xxiii. 4; *Amos* v. 22; 1 *Sam.* xx. 9, &c.

In one case, at least, we have a *Participle* in the *second clause:*

e. g., Jer. ii. 22: כִּי־אִם־תְּכַבְּסִי . . וְתַרְבִּי . . נִכְתָּם   "If though thou wash thee with nitre, and take unto thee much sope, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God."

The verb in the *second clause* may be here, as elsewhere replaced by אֵין—*e. g., Is.* viii. 20, *Jer.* xv. 1.

5.   The *Imperfect* is also used in conditions of *fact* (Class I.), where

the conclusion is regarded as imminent; but this is not a usual form of construction:

> *e. g., Prov.* iii. 34: "Though he scorneth the scorners, yet he giveth grace to the lowly."

> *e. g., Eccl.* ii. 3: "If the clouds be full of rain, they empty themselves upon the earth."

It is very unusual to find a *Perfect* in the *conclusion* after an *Imperfect* in the *Protasis.* Instances, however, occur:

> *e. g., Num.* xxxii. 23: (Class II.): אִם־לֹא תַעֲשׂוּן כֵּן הִנֵּה חֲטָאתֶם

> "But if ye will not do so, behold ye have (=ye shall have) sinned against the Lord." Cf. *Ps.* xli. 12, *Is.* i. 12, *Lam.* iii. 8, *Mal.* i. 4.

Still more unusual is it to find the *Imperfect* with *Waw conv.* in the *second clause*, but see

> *Ps.* lix. 16: יָלִינוּ   "If they are not satisfied, then they remain all night."

As noticed in Part I., the verb in the *second clause* may be *understood* (if it is the substantive verb, or the same that has been used in the *Protasis*), or its place may be supplied by יֵשׁ or אַיִן .

The entire *second clause* may be omitted by *Aposiopesis*, when the sense may be supplied from the context.

In such cases the class of condition must be determined by the verb in the *Protasis* and by the context.

NOTE.—The *Imperfect* in both clauses may also express the condition viewed as *contrary to reality*, but this is rare, and when found should be considered simply as a poetic or rhetorical expansion of the use in the condition implying *mere possibility:*

> *e. g., Jer.* xxxi. 36: . . אִם־יָמֻשׁוּ יִשְׁבְּתוּ   "If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel shall cease from being a nation before me for ever." So also v. 37.

The *Perfect* in the *Protasis*.

This use, which is the prevalent one in Arabic, is not so common in Hebrew, and would seem to have become disused after having once existed. (Cf. *Ewald Lehrb.* p. 858.)

In most, if not all, of the instances in which it is used, the special force of the tense (viz., the completion of the action) may be discovered:

1. It is found with the *Modified Perfect* or the *Imperfect* in the *Apodosis*, also not infrequently with the *Voluntative*.

2. It is also found frequently with the *Perfect*, more rarely with the *Modified Imperfect* in the *second clause*.

3. Rarely also with the verb of the *second clause* omitted, or with an *Aposiopesis* of the *clause* itself.

It is normally used in conditions, in which the idea expressed by the verb is conceived of as *completed* either in the *past, present,* or in what still is *future* but which will be *present* or *past* when the condition is realized.

It is the most common construction after לוּ and its compounds, which introduce conditions *contrary to reality.* It is found with some frequency after אִם, less commonly after כִּי, in *real, probable,* or *impossible* conditions; and is again the commonest tense when the hypothesis is expressed by a relative or an interrogative sentence, or by the simple juxtaposition of the clauses.

The *Perfect,* then, may be found in the *Protasis* of a conditional sentence implying *probability* when there is especial reference to the completion of the action expressed by the verb. It is then most frequently followed by the *Perfect* with *Waw conversive,* or by the *Imperfect;* for which (as we have seen in the case of the *Imperfect* in the *Protasis*) may be substituted the *Cohortative, Jussive,* or *Imperative:*

e. g., *Gen.* xxxii. 27: (*Second clause—Imperfect.*) לֹא אֲשַׁלֵּחֲךָ כִּי

אִם־בֵּרַכְתָּנִי: " I will not let thee go, except thou bless me (=shalt have blessed me)."

e. g., *Gen.* xxxiii. 10: (*Perfect* with *Waw.*) . . אִם־נָא מָצָאתִי

. . וְלָקַחְתָּ   "If now I have found favour in thy sight, thou wilt take an offering from my hand."

e. g., *Gen.* xviii. 3: (*Jussive* in *second clause.*) אַל־נָא תַעֲבֹר

"If now I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away from thy servant."

So also with *second clause* omitted by *Aposiopesis:*

e. g., *Gen.* xxx. 27: "And Laban said to Jacob, 'If now I have found favour in thy sight——.'"

With *Imperative* in *second clause:*

e. g., *Gen.* xlvii. 29: שִׂים־נָא יָדְךָ   "If now I have found favour in thy sight, place thy hand beneath my thigh."

This *future perfect* meaning passes sometimes into what is very nearly a *future:*

e. g., *Num.* xxxii. 17: (*Imperfect* in *second clause.*) אֲנַחְנוּ נֵחָלֵץ

אֲשֶׁר אִם־הֲבִיאֹנֻם . .   "And we will go armed before the children of Israel, until we have brought them into their place."

e. g., *Deut.* xxi. 14: (*Modified Perfect* in *second clause.*) "And it shall be (וְהָיָה) if he finds (shall have found) no pleasure in her

(אִם־לֹא חָפֵצְתָּ) that he shall send her away," &c.

e. g., 2 *Kings* vii. 4: (*Modified Perfect* in *second clause.*) אִם־אָמַרְנוּ

וּמַתְנוּ ‏ . . וְאִם־יָשַׁבְנוּ . . יְמַתְנוּ . . "If we say (shall have said) let us go into the city, and the famine is in the city, then we shall die there, but if we sit here we shall die also."

e. g., Is. xxx. 17: (Imperfect in second clause.) אִם־גַּעֲרַת ‏ . . נּוֹתַרְתֶּם "A thousand shall flee at the rebuke of one; at the rebuke of five shall ye flee, until ye be left (=shall have been left) as the beacon on the top of the mountain," &c.

e. g., Is. xliii. 20: (Imperfect in second, כִּי in first clause.) תְּכַבְּדֵנִי ‏ . . כִּי נָתַתִּי . . "The beast of the field shall honour me, the dragons and the owls, when (or because) I give (=shall have given) water in the wilderness," &c.

When the condition is in *accordance with fact*, we usually find the *Perfect* followed either by another *Perfect* or by the *Imperfect* with *Waw conversive*:

e. g., Gen. vi. 1: (כִּי in *Protasis, past time*.) "When men began to multiply upon the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them, it came to pass (וַיְהִי) that the Sons of God saw," &c.

Here the condition is of the 1st Class.

So also in *Judges* ii. 18: (כִּי in *Protasis, past time*.) "And when the Lord raised them up judges, then the Lord was with the judge."

Here the verb in the conclusion is וְהָיָה *Perfect* with simple *Waw*.

Compare also *Ps.* l. 18: (אִם in *Protasis, indefinite past*.) "When thou sawest a thief, thou consentedst with him (וַתִּרֶץ עִמּוֹ)

So also in a condition of the 4th Class, *i. e., contrary to fact*:

e. g., Ps. lxxiii. 15: (אִם in *Protasis, definite past time*.) "If I had said, let me be made like unto them, behold I should have despised (בָגַדְתִּי) the generations of thy children."

We have seen that this class of conditions *may* be expressed, when referring to indefinite present or future time, by the *Imperfect* in both clauses (*v.* p. 61). The more common method, however, is by means of the *Perfect* after לוּ, which will be considered later on under that particle.

Other examples of the use of the *Perfect* after אִם in this class of conditions are—*Ezek*. iii. 6, *Jer*. xxiii. 22, xxxiii. 25, *Psalms* xliv. 21, lxvi. 18, *Job*. ix. 15, 16, *Deut*. xxxii. 30, *Ruth* i. 12.

In all of these, however, we find an *Imperfect* in the *second clause*, even where we should expect a *Perfect*, showing that to the Hebrew mind the assumption of possibility or probability implied by the very act of putting the idea in a hypothetical form, influenced the choice of

tenses in the clauses, and conformed them to the common type of prob-
able suppositions:

> *e. g., Ezek.* iii. 6: "Surely had I sent thee to them, they would
> hearken (יִשְׁמְעוּ) unto thee."

So also *Jer.* xxiii. 22:   אִם־עָמְדוּ and וִישִׁבוּם   "But if they had
stood in my counsel, and had caused my people to hear my words, then
should they have turned them from their wicked way and from the evil
of their doings."

So *Ps.* lxvi. 18; "If I had looked at vanity in my heart (רָאִיתִי) the
Lord would not have heard me (יִשְׁמַע)   But God has heard," &c.

As after the *Imperfect* in the *Protasis,* so also we may have, after a
Perfect, the verb in the *second clause* omitted entirely, or its place sup-
plied by יֵשׁ or אֵין

> This occurs sometimes when the condition is *probable;* (Class II.)
> *e. g., Prov.* xxiv. 14: (יֵשׁ)   "So shall knowledge be unto thy soul:
> when thou hast found it there is a reward."

Sometimes when the condition is viewed as an actual *fact:*

> *e. g., Ps.* ciii. 16: וְאֵינֶנּוּ   "As soon as the wind passeth over upon
> it, then it is not."

The *second clause* is sometimes, though rarely, omitted, as with an
Imperfect in the *Protasis,* when its sense may be supplied from the con-
text:

> *e. g., Gen.* xxx. 27: "If now I have found favour in thy sight—
> (tarry with me)——."

So also 1 *Sam.* xxi. 6, *Ezek.* xiv. 22.

The *Participle.*

When it is desired to lay especial emphasis upon the existing or
enduring nature of the verbal idea expressed in the *Protasis,* the *Parti-
ciple* may be used; in this case the condition is almost always *probable*
(Class II.):

a. It is most frequently followed by an *Imperative* in the *second
clause;*

> *e. g., Num.* xi. 15:   וְאִם־כָּכָה אַתְּ־עֹשֶׂה לִּי הָרְגֵנִי נָא הָרֹג   "And
> if thus though art dealing with me, slay me, I pray thee, at once."
> *e. g., Judg.* ix. 15: בֹּאוּ חֲסוּ · · מֹשְׁחִים · · אִם "And the
> bramble said unto the trees, If in truth ye anoint me king over
> you, then come and put your trust in my shadow," &c.

It is also sometimes followed by an *Imperfect:*

> *e. g., Lev.* iii. 1: "If he offer it of the herd, whether it be male

or female, he shall offer it without blemish before the Lord."
(וַקְרִיבֶנּי)

Or by the *Modified Perfect:*

> *e. g., Lev.* iii. 7: " If he offer a lamb for his offering, then shall he
> offer it before the Lord."   (יְהְקִרִיב)

Or by the *Perfect* without וְ

> *e. g., Judg.* xv. 3:   (כִּי in *Protasis.* Class III.)   "And Samson
> said concerning them, now shall I be more blameless (shall I have
> been) than the Philistines, though I do them a displeasure."   (נִקֵּיתִי)

It is once at least followed by the *Perfect* in a condition in accordance
with fact in *Jer.* xliv. 19: (כִּי in *Protasis.*) "And when we burned
incense to the queen of heaven, &c., did we make her cakes to worship
her, or pour out drink offerings unto her, without our men?"   (עָשִׂינוּ)

It may be also followed by another *Participle*, in which the immedi-
ateness of the action is made prominent:

> *e. g., Jer.* xxvi. 15: (אִם in *Protasis.*)   " But ye may know for a
> certainty that, if ye kill me, ye will bring (אַתֶּם נֹתְנִים) innocent
> blood upon yourselves," &c.

Condition *contrary to reality* introduced by לוּ

We have seen that conditions *contrary to reality* may be expressed
by the *Imperfect in both clauses* after אִם, or (rarely) by the *Perfect*
in both clauses after אִם or כִּי, and somewhat more often by the *Perfect*
in *Protasis* and *Imperfect* in the *Apodosis.*

The more usual and regular method is by means of sentences intro-
duced by לוּ and its compounds, in which the *Perfect* is generally found
in the *Protasis;* usually with another *Perfect* in the *second clause:*

> *c. g., Is.* i. 9; " If the Lord of Hosts had not left unto us a very
> small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and should have
> been made like unto Gomorrha."   (לוּלֵא . . הוֹתִיר . . דָּמִינוּ . . הָיִינוּ)

So *Ps.* cxix. 92: " If my delight had not been in thy law, I should
have perished in my trouble."   (אָבַרְתִּי)

But also by the *Imperfect:*

> *e. g., Deut.* xxxii. 29: " If they were wise, they would consider
> this."   (יַשְׂכִּילוּ, יָבִינוּ)

The verb in the *second clause* is sometimes *omitted:*

> *e. g.,* I *Sam.* xiv. 30: " How much more if the people had eaten
> this day of the spoil of their enemies."   . . (אַף כִּי לוּא אָכֹל אָכַל
> הָעָם)

Sometimes the *second clause* is *omitted* by *Aposiopesis*, and the particle becomes like אִם a particle of asseveration:

> *e. g.*, *Ps.* xxvii. 13: (לוּלֵא הֶאֱמַנְתִּי לִרְאוֹת) "If I have not trusted (=verily, I have trusted) to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living."

The condition after לוּ sometimes relates to present or future time, in which case we may have the *Imperfect* in the *Protasis* followed by a *Voluntative:*

> *e. g.*, *Deut.* xxxii. 26, 27: (*Cohortative.*) "I said, I would scatter them into corners, I would make the remembrance of them to cease among men, were it not that I fear the wrath of the enemy." (אַשְׁבִּיתָה and לוּלֵי . . אָגוּר)

Or a *Jussive* in the *Protasis:*

> *e. g.*, *Gen.* xxx. 34: (*Second clause omitted.*) "And Laban said, ' May it be according to thy word.'" (לוּ יְהִי)

Or an *Imperative* in the *Protasis:*

> *e. g.*, *Gen.* xxiii. 13: (*Second clause omitted.*) "If only thou wouldst hear me!" (לוּ שְׁמָעֵנִי)

Or a *Participle* in *Protasis:*

> *e. g.*, 2 *Sam.* xviii. 12: (*Imperfect.*) "And the man said to Joab, If I held (were now holding) in my hand a thousand pieces of silver, I would not put forth my hand against the king's son." (וְלוּא —)
>
> (. . . אַנֹכִי שֹׁקֵל . . . לֹא־אֶשְׁלַח)

Or it may have the verb *omitted* and its place *supplied* by יֵשׁ

> *e. g.*, *Num.* xxii. 29: (*Perfect* in the *second clause* after כִּי עַתָּה) "If there were a sword in my hand, surely now would I kill thee." Or considering an ellipsis before כִּי עַתָּה "If only there were a sword in my hand! for then would I have killed thee." (הֲרַגְתִּיךְ)

So also *Job.* xvi. 4: "If your souls were in my soul's stead, I would heap up words against you." (אַחְבִּירָה *Cohortative.*)

With the Aramaic form אִלּוּ the *Perfect* is found in both clauses, and the *condition* is *contrary to reality:*

> *e. g.*, *Eccl.* vi. 6: וְאִלּוּ חָיָה . . . לֹא רָאָה "Yea, if he live a thousand years twice told, yet hath he seen no good." Cf. *Esth.* vii. 4., these being the only instances in which it occurs.

Asseverations.

In *asseverations* we find the Hebrew made use of incomplete conditional sentences introduced by כִּי־אִם , אִם לֹא , אִם These may be considered as simple conditions implying *probability*, with the **second**

clause suppressed. The *second clause* if expressed, as it is some-times, has a *Voluntative* force.   Accordingly, in such sentences אִם has the meaning of *"surely not,"* and אִם לֹא and כִּי־אִם of *"surely,"* *" verily."*

The *second clause* is sometimes expressed, and is usually some such form as *"Be it profane to me* (הָלִילָה), or *"God do so to me and more also* (כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה יְהֹוָה לִי וְכֹה יֹסִיף) or some corresponding form of im-precation.

In these forms of condition the usual tense is the *Imperfect*, with either a future or an aorist sense:

> *e.g.,* 1 *Sam.* xiv. 45ᵇ: "God forbid, as the Lord liveth, there shall not one hair of his head fall to the ground." (חָלִילָה חַי־יְהֹוָה אִם
> יִפֹּל --)

> *e.g.,* 1 *Sam.* xix. 6: "And Saul sware, 'as the Lord liveth, he shall not be slain.'" (חַי־יְהֹוָה אִם־יוּמָת)

The *Perfect* is more rarely found, sometimes with its usual past sig-nification:

> *e.g.,* 2 *Kings* ix. 26: "Surely I have seen yesterday the blood of Naboth and the blood of his sons, saith the Lord." . . (אִם־לֹא
> רָאִיתִי)

Sometimes with a *present* signification:

> *e.g., Ps.* cxxxi. 2: "Surely I have behaved and quieted myself (and still do) as a child that is weaned from his mother." (אִם־לֹא
> שִׁוִּיתִי וְדוֹמַמְתִּי)

Sometimes in the Prophets with a *future* signification:

> *e.g., Is.* xiv. 24: "The Lord of Hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely (אִם־לֹא) as I have sworn, so shall it come to pass (כֵּן הָיָתָה), and as I have purposed it shall stand " (הִיא תָקוּם *Imperfect*).

So *Jer.* xv. 11: "The Lord said, Verily (אִם־לֹא) it shall be well with thy remnant; verily, I will intreat the enemy for thee in the time of evil and affliction." (הִפְגַּעְתִּי)

Verb in *Protasis* omitted.

We have seen in Part I. that the verb in the *first clause* of a condi-tional sentence is often *omitted*, and that its place is often supplied by יֵשׁ and אֵין   This may take place in any of the classes of conditions, but is most common when the supposition is *probable* (Class II.), and when the verb in the *second clause* is a *Jussive* or *Imperative*:

e. g., 2 *Sam.* xvii. 6b: (אֵין *Imperative.*)   "If not, speak thou."

(אִם־אַיִן אַתָּה דַבֵּר׃)

So *Judges* ix. 20: (אַיִן *Jussive.*)   "But if not, let fire come forth from Abimelech and devour the men of Shechem and the house of Millo." (וְאִם־אַיִן תֵּצֵא אֵשׁ)

So also 1 *Chron.* xii. 17b: (*Verb omitted—Jussive.*)   "But if (it be) to betray me to mine enemies, seeing there is no wrong in mine hands, the God of our fathers look thereon and rebuke it." (יֵרֶא וְיוֹכַח)

> *e. g.*, *Jer.* xl. 4: (*Verb omitted—Imperative.*)   "If (it be) good in thine eyes to come with me to Babylon, come; and I will look well unto thee," &c. (חֲדַל and בֹּא)

It is also frequently followed by the *Imperfect* or the *Modified Perfect* when expressing *probability:*

> *e. g.*, 2 *Kings* ii. 10: (אַיִן *Imperfect.*)   "But if not, it shall not be so." (וְאִם־אַיִן לֹא יִהְיֶה)

> *e. g.*, 1 *Sam.* xi. 3b: (אֵין *Modified Perfect.*)   "And then if (there be) no man to save us, we will come out to thee." (וְיָצָאנוּ)

> *e. g.*, *Gen.* xviii. 21: (*Verb omitted—Cohortative.*)   "I will go down now and see whether they have done altogether according to the crying of it which is come unto me, and if not, I shall know." (אִם־לֹא אֵדָעָה)

> *e. g.*, *Ex.* i. 16: (*Verb omitted—Modified Perfect.*)   "If it (be) a son, then ye shall kill him; but if it (be) a daughter, then she shall live." (וְהָיָה and וַהֲמִתֶּן)

> *e. g.*, *Lev.* xxv. 51: (*Verb omitted—Imperfect.*)   "And if there (be) yet many years, according to them shall he give again the price of his redemption out of the money he was bought for." (יָשִׁיב)

It is also, but *rarely*, followed by a *Participle* in the conclusion of a *probable* hypothesis:

> *e. g.*, 1 *Sam.* xix. 11: (אֵין with *Participle* in *Protasis.*) "If thou save not thy life to-night, to-morrow slain art thou." (אִם־אֵינְךָ מְמַלֵּט) and (אַתָּה מוּמָת)

> *Gen.* xxx. 1b: (אַיִן alone.)   "Give me children, or if not, dying am I." (מֵתָה אָנֹכִי)

> 1 *Sam.* xxvi. 19b: (*Verb omitted.*)   "But if (it be) the children of men, *cursed* be they before Jehovah!" (אֲרוּרִים הֵם)

When the supposition is simply in *accordance with reality*, we may

find in the conclusion a *Perfect*, or even a *Modified Imperfect*. The instances, however, of this construction are very few:

> *e. g., Hos.* xii. 12: (*Verb omitted—Perfect.*) " If (there is) idolatry (in) Gilead, surely they are vanity." (הָיוּ)

> *Job.* xxxiii. 23, 24: (יֵשׁ, *Modified Imperfect.*)   " If there be a messenger with him, an interpreter, one of a thousand, to show unto man his uprightness, then he is gracious unto him," &c. (וַיְחֻנֶּנּוּ)

When, however, the supposition is either *improbable, indefinite*, or *contrary to reality* (Class III. and Class IV.), the *Imperfect* is the usual tense in the conclusion:

> *e. g.,* 1 *Sam.* xiv. 39:   (יֶשְׁנוֹ, Class III.) " For as the Lord liveth which saveth Israel, though it be Jonathan my son, he shall surely die." (מוֹת יָמוּת)

> *Job.* xxi. 4: (*Verb omitted*, Class IV.) "As for me (is) my complaint to man, and if (it were so) why should not my spirit be troubled ?" (תִקְצַר)

So also once with לוּ as cited above, *Job.* xvi. 4 (*v.* p. 66).

When כִּי־אָם is used before nouns, the implied supposition is always of the first class, *i. e., in accordance with reality*, as may be seen by the examples already cited (p. 47, Part I.). Compare also *Josh.* xiv. 4, *Deut.* x. 12 (where the particle stands before an *Infinitive* with לְ),

2 *Kings* xiii. 7 *et al.*

The *Perfect* is the usual tense in the *second clause:*

> *e. g., Josh.* xiv. 4b: " Therefore they gave no part unto the Levites in the land, save cities to dwell in." (נָתְנוּ)

However, in *Num.* xxxv. 33 the *Imperfect* is used, as also in *Prov.* xviii. 2 to express a general truth without limit of time, and also in *Jer.* xliv. 14 to express a true *future:*

> *e. g., Num.* xxxv. 33: " For the land cannot be purified from the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of him that shed it." (לֹא־יְכֻפַּר)

> *Jer.* xliv. 14b: " For none shall return except those who escape." (לֹא־יָשׁוּבוּ)

When this compound particle is used with verbs, it is usually followed by an *Imperfect* or *Voluntative*, and the condition may be considered as implying probability, and so of Class II. A few examples will show this use:

> *e. g., Jer.* ix. 23: " But he that glorieth (*i. e.,* But if any man glorieth), let him glory in this." (יִתְהַלֵּל)

> *e. g., Jer.* xxxix. 12: (*K'tib.*) "Take him, and look well unto

him, and do him no harm, *but* (whatsoever thou doest unto him) do unto him even as he shall say unto thee." (כִּי־אִם כַּאֲשֶׁר יְדַבֵּר

אֵלֶיךָ כֵּן עֲשֵׂה עִמּוֹ)

When followed by the *Perfect*, the *reality* of the supposition is implied:

> *e. g.*, 2 *Kings* xxiii. 9: " Nevertheless the priests of the high places came not up to the altar of the Lord at Jerusalem, *but* (if they had priestly privileges) they did eat of the unleavened bread among their brethren." (כִּי אִם־אָכְלוּ)

So also *Jer.* vii. 23, cited above: "*But* (if I commanded them anything) this thing commanded I them, saying," &c. (צִוִּיתִי)

Very frequently the verb in the *second clause* is omitted entirely, in which case the class of condition must be determined from the context:

> *e. g.*, *Jer.* xxiii. 7, 8: " Therefore, behold the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; *but* (כִּי־אִם) if they say anything, they shall say (The Lord liveth," &c.)

In one passage we have a *Participle* in the *second clause:*

> *e. g.*, 2 *Kings* xvii. 40: " Howbeit they did not hearken, *but* according to their former manner they are doing (to this day.") (הֵם עִשִׂים)

The *Infinitive.*

When the *Infinitive* stands in the *Protasis* after conditional particles, it is followed by the *Imperfect* when the supposition is *probable* (Class II.), but the construction is rare:

> *e. g.*, 2 *Sam.* iii. 13b: " Thou shalt not see my face unless thou bringest (הֲבִיאֲךָ) Michal the daughter of Saul," &c.

So 2 *Sam.* v. 6.

It is also once followed by the *Perfect* in a sentence belonging to Class I. (Hypothesis in accordance with *reality*):

> *e. g.*, *Job.* ix. 27, 28: " If I say (אִם־אָמְרִי) I will forget my complaints, &c.   I am afraid of all my sorrows (יָגֹרְתִּי)   I know (יָדַעְתִּי) that thou wilt not hold me innocent."

Conditions introduced by אוֹ being mainly continuative, are governed by the context. All that have been observed, however, belong to the class of *probable* suppositions (Class II.).

Condition introduced by Waw.

Very frequently a condition introduced by אִם or כִּי , is continued in a following sentence by ו . In this case, as with אוֹ , the class of condi-

tion is determined from the context, and the use of the tenses is the same as if the particles had been used.

Frequently, however, Conditional Sentences are introduced by Waw, without any preceding conditional particle or clause.

When this occurs, we usually find the *Modified Perfect* in the *Protasis*, followed in the *Apodosis* either by another *Modified Perfect* or, though rarely, by an *Imperfect*. Sentences of this form almost always imply *probability*:

> e. g., *Ex.* xii. 13: (*Modified Perfect* in *second clause*.) "And the blood shall be to you for a sign upon the houses where ye are, and when I see the blood I will pass over you." (וְרָאִיתִי . . וּפָסַחְתִּי)

> e. g., *Num.* xxiii. 20b: (*Imperfect* in *second clause*.) "Since he blesseth, then I cannot reverse it." (וּבֵרֵךְ וְלֹא אֲשִׁיבֶנָּה:)

A *probable* condition may also be expressed by the *Imperfect* in the *Protasis* followed by a *Modified Perfect*, another *Imperfect*, or a *Voluntative*:

> e. g., *Deut.* xxx. 8, 9: (*Modified Perfect* in *second clause*.) "And if thou shalt return and obey the voice of the Lord, and do all his commandments which I command thee this day, then the Lord thy God will make thee plenteous in every work of thine hand." (יְאַתָּה תָשׁוּב וְשָׁמַעְתָּ . . וְהוֹתִירְךָ . .)

> e. g., 1 *Sam.* ix. 7: (*Imperfect* in *second clause*.) "Then said Saul unto his servant, But behold if we go, what shall we bring the man?" (יְהִנֵּה נֵלֵךְ וּמַה־נָּבִיא . .)

> e. g., *Ps.* lxxvii. 4: (*Cohortative* in *second clause*.) "When I am in heaviness (יֶאֱהֶמָיָה) I will remember God (אֶזְכְּרָה) when my spirit is overwhelmed (יִתְעַטֵּף רוּחִי) I will complain." (אָשִׂיחָה)

The same kind of condition is very rarely expressed by a *Modified Imperfect* in the *Protasis*, followed by a *Participle*:

> e. g., *Ex.* iv. 23: "And if thou refuse (וַתְּמָאֵן) to let him go, behold I will slay thy son, (אָנֹכִי הֹרֵג) even thy firstborn."

The literal translation would be: "And thou hast refused to let him go, behold I am slaying," &c. (The action is viewed as completed and bringing with it its consequences.)

Another variation is in the use of the *Voluntative* in the *Protasis:*

> e. g., *Ps.* cxxxix. 8: (With *verb omitted* in *second clause*.) "If I make Sheol my bed, behold Thee!" (יְאַצִּיעָה שְּׁאוֹל הִנֶּךָ:)

> e. g., *Job.* xvi. 6: (With *Imperfect* in *second clause*.) "—and if I speak, what am I eased?" (יְאַחְדְּלָה מַה־מִּנִּי יַהֲלֹךְ:)

It may, indeed, be questioned whether all the instances of the *Imper-*

fect thus occurring after *Waw* should not be regarded as properly *Jussive*, according to the corresponding use in Arabic.

But besides these methods of expressing a condition regarded as *probable* when introduced by *Waw*, there are a number of instances where the verb in the *first clause* must be regarded not as a *Modified* but as a *simple Perfect*. I pass by many examples where (as in *Gen.* xxxiii. 13) it must be considered at least doubtful whether the verb is to be rendered as a *Perfect* or as a *Modified Perfect*, and in which there is no difference in accent by which the tense may be recognized; but in four instances at least—*Job.* x. 15, *Ezek.* iii. 18, xxxiii. 8, *Nah.* i. 2—the accent shows that the verb was regarded as *Perfect* by the Masoretes:

e. g., Job. x. 15: (*Imperfect* in *second clause.*) "If (אִם) I be wicked, woe unto me, and if I be righteous (וְצָדַקְתִּי) yet will I not lift up my head."

e. g., Ezek. iii. 18: (*Imperfect in second clause.*) "When I say (בְּאָמְרִי) to the wicked, 'Thou shalt surely die,' if thou givest him not warning, (וְלֹא הִזְהַרְתּוֹ) and if thou speakest not (וְלֹא דִבַּרְתָּ) to turn the wicked from his evil way, &c.—he shall die (יָמוּת) in his iniquity, but his blood will I require (אֲבַקֵּשׁ) at thy hands.'"

When the *Condition* is in accordance with *reality* (Class I.), we may have the *Perfect* or the *Modified Imperfect* in the *Protasis*, with the corresponding tenses in the *conclusion:*

c. g., Ex. xvi. 21: (*Perfect* in both clauses.) "And when the sun grew hot, it melted." (וְחַם הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְנָמָס׃)

e. g., 1 *Sam.* ii. 16: (*Modified Imperfect* and *Perfect.*) "And if the man said (וַיֹּאמֶר) to him, &c., then he would say." (וְאָמַר)

e. g., 2 *Sam.* xviii. 16: (*Modified Imperfect* in both clauses.) "And when Joab blew the horn (וַיִּתְקַע) the people returned from following after Israel." (וַיָּשָׁב הָעָם)

To express conditions in which the supposition is contrary to reality (Class IV.), we find sometimes the *Perfect* in the *Protasis*, with the *Imperfect* in the *conclusion:*

e. g., Num. xii. 14: "And Moses said, If her father had but spit in her face (וְ . . . יָרֹק יָרַק) should she not be unclean (תִּכָּלֵם) seven days?"

Sometimes the *Imperfect* with the *Imperfect* in the *conclusion:*

e. g., Ezek. xvi. 55: "When thy sisters, Sodom and her daughters, shall return (תָּשֹׁבְןָ) to their former estate, and when, &c., then thou and thy daughters shalt return (תְּשֻׁבֶינָה) to your former estate."

Once, at least, the *Modified Perfect* in *Protasis*, and no verb expressed in *second clause:*

> *e. g., Ezek.* xvi. 53: "When I shall bring again (וְשַׁבְתִּי) their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, then (will I bring again) the captivity of thy captives in the midst of them."

Sentences without any Introductory Particle.

A sentence which contains an interrogative idea, *i. e.*, either a direct or an indirect question, may stand as the *Protasis* of a conditional sentence, or, as we have seen, two clauses placed together, either without any connecting particle or with *simple Waw*, may bear to each other the relation of *condition* and *conclusion*.

When the supposition is a *probable* one, or simply *indeterminate*, the usual construction is with the *Imperfect* in the *Protasis*—usually with the *Imperfect* or the *Modified Perfect* in the *second clause:*

> *e. g., Is.* xlvi. 7ᵇ: "Yea (if) one shall cry unto him (יִצְעַק), yet can he not answer (לֹא יַעֲנֶה), nor save him out of all his trouble."

It may also be followed by an *Imperative*, though when this is used the *Perfect* usually precedes:

> *e. g., Ps.* xxvii. 7: (שְׁמַע־יְהוָֹה קוֹלִי אֶקְרָא) "(When) I cry with my voice, *hear*, O Lord."

Or the verb may be *understood* in the *second clause:*

> *e. g.*, 2 *Sam.* xxiii. 4: "And (he shall be) as (is) the light of the morning (when) the sun ariseth." (יִזְרַח)

The *Voluntative* (*Jussive* or *Imperative*) may be found in the *Protasis* in place of the *Imperfect*.

In this case the verb in the *second clause* may be in the *Imperfect:*

> *e. g., Prov.* xix. 25: "Smite a scorner (לֵץ תַּכֶּה), and the simple will beware (יַעְרִם), and reprove (וְהוֹכִיחַ) one that hath understanding, he will understand knowledge." (יָבִין)

Or it may be in the *Perfect*, with *Future Perfect* sense:

> *e. g., Is.* xxvi. 10: "Let favour be shown (יֻחַן) to the wicked, yet will he not learn (have learned) (בַּל־לָמַד) righteousness."

Or it may be another *Jussive* or *Imperative:*

> *e. g., Ps.* lxviii. 2: "Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered." (יָקוּם and יָפִיצוּ)

> *e. g.*, 2 *Kings* v. 13: "Wash and be clean." (רְחַץ וּטְהָר)

The *Perfect* is sometimes found in a condition implying *probability*, but only when the verb in the *second clause* is of *Jussive* signification:

e. g., Prov. xxv. 16: (*Imperative.*) "Hast thou found honey, eat so much as is sufficient for thee." (אֱכֹל and מָצָאתָ)

e. g., Judg. vii. 3: (*Jussive.*) " Whosoever is fearful and afraid, let him return, and depart early from Mt. Gilead." (יָשֹׁב and יָרֵא)

e. g., Prov. xxii. 29: (*Jussive.*) " Seest thou a man that is diligent in business; he shall stand before kings." (יִתְיַצָּב)

e. g., Is. xxvi. 11: (*Imperfect* with *Jussive force.*) " Lord, though thine arm is lifted up, they *will* not see." (יֶחֱזָיוּן)

(The two last are the only instances observed where there can be any question as to the *Jussive* character of the verb.)

Beside these forms of the finite verb, the *Construct Infinitive* with a *Preposition* בְּ or לְ may stand in the *Protasis* of a conditional Sentence implying *probability*.

When the verb in the *second clause* is expressed, it is usually, if not always, in the *Imperfect*:

e. g., Ps. iv. 5: " The Lord will hear when I call unto him."

(יְהוָה יִשְׁמַע בְּקָרְאִי אֵלָיו)

When the supposition is viewed as a *fact*, the most common construction is with the *Perfect* in the *Protasis*, and also in the *Conclusion:*

e. g., Ps. cxix. 51: " Though the proud have had me greatly in derision, I have not declined from thy law."   (נָטִיתִי , הֱלִיצֻנִי)

So also *Is.* xlviii. 21: (הוֹלִיכָם , לֹא צָמְאוּ) "And they thirsted not (though) He led them through the deserts."

The verb in the *second clause* is sometimes *understood*, as in all classes of conditional sentences:

e. g., Prov. xxvi. 12, xxix. 20, xxiv. 10, *Lev.* xv. 3.

Though the *Perfect* is the usual tense in conditions of this description, we also, in poetry, find the *Imperfect* not infrequently, and always when the verb is expressed followed by another *Imperfect*:

e. g., Ex. xv. 7: (יֹאכְלֵמוֹ , תְּשַׁלַּח)   " When thou sentest forth thy wrath, it devoured them like stubble."

e. g., Job. xii. 15: (וְיָבֵשׁוּ , יַעְצֹר)   " Behold, he shutteth up the waters, and they dry up."   " *When* or *if* he shutteth up the waters, they dry up."

Ps. civ. 28, 29, 30: . . . יִשְׂבְּעוּן . . תִּפְתַּח . . יִלְקֹטוּן . . תִּתֵּן
. . יִבָּרֵאוּן . . תְּשַׁלַּח . . יִגְוָעוּן . . תֹסֵף . . יִבָּהֵלוּן . . תַּסְתִּיר
" Thou givest them, they gather; thou openest thine hand, they are filled with good; Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die and return to their dust; Thou sendest forth thy word, they are created."

Another not unusual form of this condition is with the *Participle* in

the *Protasis*, followed usually by the *Perfect* in the *second clause*.

This occurs most frequently in the book of *Proverbs*, and is a very terse form of expression:

 e. g., *Prov.* xvii. 5ᵃ: "(Whoso) mocketh the poor, reproacheth his maker." (לֹעֵג and חֵרֵף)

The *Modified Imperfect* is once found:

 2 *Kings* vi. 5: "It came to pass, when one was felling a beam, that the axe head fell in the water." (. . . . וַיְהִי הָאֶחָד מַפִּיל)

The *Infinitive* with *Preposition* may stand as the *Protasis* in a condition of this kind, though this is of rare occurrence. It is followed by an *Imperfect* in *Lam.* ii. 12: (· · בְּהִתְעַטְּפָם · · יֹאמְרוּ) "They say to their mothers, where is corn and wine? when they swoon in the streets of the city, when their soul is poured out (בְּהִשְׁתַּפֵּךְ) into their mothers' bosom."

In *Ps.* lxii. 10 the verb in *second clause* is omitted: (בְּמֹאזְנַיִם לַעֲלוֹת הֵמָּה מֵהֶבֶל יָחַד:) "*When* they are laid in a balance they (are) alike with emptiness."

In *Ps.* xlii. 11 the verb in *second clause* is *Perfect*: (· · חֵרְפוּנִי בְּאָמְרָם · ·) "As with a sword in my bones, mine enemies reproach me, *when* they daily say unto me, where is thy God?"

Conditions *contrary to reality* are rare without an introductory Particle, but occur in a few instances. They are sometimes expressed by the *Perfect* in the *Protasis*, followed by the *Imperfect* in the *second clause*:

 e. g., 2 *Kings* v. 13: "Had the prophet said (דִּבֶּר) some great thing unto thee, wouldst thou not have done it?" (הֲלוֹא תַעֲשֶׂה)

And also by the *Imperfect* in the *Protasis*, followed either by an *Imperfect* in the *second clause*:

 e. g., *Job* xiii. 15: (q'ri) after הֵן "Behold, though He kill me (יִקְטְלֵנִי) yet will I trust in Him" (אֲיַחֵל).

Or by a *Perfect*:

 e. g., *Job* ix. 13: "If God withdraw not his wrath, the proud helpers will stoop beneath him." (לֹא־יָשִׁיב · · שָׁחֲחוּ)

The *Cohortative* also may appear in *Protasis*, followed by the *Perfect* in *second clause*:

 e. g., *Ps.* xl. 6: "If I should (wish to) declare them (אַגִּידָה) or speak of them, (וַאֲדַבֵּרָה) they are more than can be numbered." (עָצְמוּ מִסַּפֵּר)

The *Participle* also may stand in the *Protasis*, and be followed by an *Imperfect*:

e. g., 2 *Kings* vii. 2 and also 19: "Behold, if the Lord opened (עֹשֶׂה) windows in heaven, might this thing be?" (הֲיִהְיֶה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה)

From the instances that have been given, in this article and in the accompanying Tables, it may be seen that, while there are *four* classes of condition which must appear in any translation of the Hebrew into a modern language, there are in fact only *three* that are distinguishable by the verbal forms used:

1st.   When the supposition is a *fact* (Class I.).

2d.   When the supposition is *probable*, *possible*, or even a *mere assumption* (Classes II. and III.).

3d.   When the supposition is *contrary to fact* or very *highly improbable* (Class IV.).

In the first, the *Perfect*, or its corresponding secondary tense, is most common in the *Protasis*.

In the second, the *Imperfect*, or its corresponding secondary tense, is usual in the *Protasis*.

In the third, the condition is usually indicated by לוּ or one of its compounds. When this is the case the *Perfect* is the usual tense; but if the introductory particle be אִם , or if there be no special introductory particle, we generally find the *Imperfect*.

In the *Apodosis* there is great liberty of usage in all forms of condition, but the appearance of a *Voluntative* form (*Jussive, Cohortative*, or *Imperative*) will invariably show the hypothesis in the *Protasis* to be *probable;* while a *Perfect* or a *Modified Imperfect* are rarely found in the conclusion, except after suppositions in accordance with *reality*.

The underlying principles are the same as in Greek or English, but the niceties of expression and the exactness of grammar had been lost to the Hebrew language long before it began to be preserved and fixed by being committed to writing.

From the analogy of the Arabic, we may see that the use of the *Perfect* to express a *probable* hypothesis in *future* time, is a remnant of an earlier, more highly developed, grammatical structure, similar to the Arabic. The same may also be inferred from the use of the *Jussive* in conditions, and of the *Imperfect* in a *Jussive* sense, even when *Indicative* in form.

NOTE.—In the accompanying Tables will be found the whole collection of Conditional Sentences observed by the writer, from which the above instances have been taken. He has no idea that the collection is a complete one, but trusts that it is sufficiently extensive to justify the inferences drawn from it in this article.

TABLE OF INSTANCES

OF CONDITIONAL SENTENCES IN HEBREW, WITH A GENERAL SUMMARY AND RECAPITULATION.

This Table explains itself. In the first column is found the reference; in the second, the tense, verbal form, or substitute therefor, used in the *Apodosis;* in the third column, the number indicates to which of the four classes of conditions the particular instance is to be referred. The passages are arranged according to the verbal form used in the *Protasis*, and are given in the order of arrangement of the English Bible.

I.

Without any Introductory Particle.

1.—With *Perfect* in the *Protasis.*

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Lev. x. 19.	Imperfect,	4	*Prov.* xi. 2.	Mod.Imperfect,	1
xv. 3.	Verb omitted,	1	xvii. 5.b	Imperfect (Jussive force),	2
Num. xii. 14.	Imperfect,	4	xviii. 22.	Perfect,	1
Deut. xx. 5.	Jussive,	2	xix. 24.	Imperfect,	3
xx. 6.	Jussive,	2	xxii. 3.a	Perfect (q'ri), Imp'f't (k'tib)	1
xx. 7.	Jussive,	2	xxii. 3.b	Perfect,	1
xxxii. 30.	Imperfect,	4	xxii. 29.	Jussive,	2
Josh. xxii. 18.	Mod. Perfect,		xxiv. 10.	Verb omitted,	1
Judg. vii. 3.	Jussive,	2	xxv. 16.	Imperative,	2
Ruth i. 12.	Imperfect,	4	xxvi. 12.	Verb omitted,	1
1 *Sam.* i. 28.	Participle,	2	xxvi. 15.	Perfect (cf. xix. 24),	3
xvii. 34.	Perfect,	1	xxvii. 12.a	Perfect,	1
2 *Kings* v. 13.	Imperfect,	4	xxvii. 12.b	Perfect,	1
Job. iv. 2.	Imperfect,	2	*Eccl.* vi. 10.	Perfect,	1
iv. 21.	Imperfect,	2	*Is.* xxvi. 11.	Imperfect,	3
vii. 20.	Imperfect,	2	xlviii. 21.	Perfect,	1
xix. 4.	Imperfect,	3	liii. 7.	Imperfect,	1
xxi. 21.	Verb omitted,	1	*Jer.* xxxiii. 25.	Imperfect,	4
xxiii. 10.	Imperfect,	2	*Lam.* i. 21.	Imperfect,	1
xxiv. 24.	אֵין and Perfect,	3	iii. 37.	Perfect,	1
xxvii. 19.	אֵין	1	*Hos.* ix. 6.	Imperfect,	3
Ps. xxxix. 12.	Mod.Imperfect,	1	x. 13.	Perfect,	1
lxix. 33.	Imperfect,	2	*Amos.* iii. 8.a	Imperfect,	2
ciii. 16.	אֵין and Imp'f't,	1	iii. 8.b	Imperfect,	2
cxix. 51.	Perfect.	1	*Hag.* ii. 16.a	Perfect,	1
cxix. 61.	Perfect,	1	ii. 16.b	Perfect,	1
cxxxix. 18.b	Verb omitted,	1			

2.—With *Imperfect* in *Protasis*.

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	l. 25.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Ps.*	xxviii. 1.ᵇ	*Mod. Perfect,	2
Ex.	iv. 1.	2d cl. omitted,	2		xci. 15.	Imperfect,	2
	xiii. 19.	Mod. Perfect,	2		civ. 22.	Imperfect,	1
	xv. 7.	Imperfect,	1		civ. 28.	(2) Imperfect,	1
	xxxiii. 5.	Mod. Perfect,	3		civ. 29.	(2) Imperfect,	1
Lev.	xviii. 5.	Mod. Perfect (cf.			civ. 30.	Imperfect,	1
		Neh. ix. 29),	2		cxxxix. 18.	Imperfect,	2
Num.	xxiii. 3.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Prov.*	ii. 2, 5.	Imperfect,	2
Deut.	viii. 12-14.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Is.*	xlvi. 7.	Imperfect,	3
2 *Sam.*	xxiii. 4.	Verb omitted,	2	*Jer.*	iii. 1.	Imperfect,	2
1 *Kgs.*	xviii. 12.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Ezek.*	xvii. 10.	Imperfect,	2
Neh.	i. 8.	Imperfect,	3		†xx. 11.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	ix. 29.	Mod. Perfect (cf.			xx. 13.	Mod. Perfect,	2
		Lev. xviii. 5),	2	*Mal.*	i. 4.	Imperfect,	3
Job	ix. 13.	Perfect,	4				
	ix. 29.	Imperfect,	3				
	xxiii. 8.	אֵין	1				
	xxix. 24.	Imperfect,	1				
Ps.	xxvii. 7.	Imperative,	2				

*Accent brought back by *pause.*
† Common reading in this verse
יְהִי, but וְחָי as in v. 13 is evidently
to be read.

3.—With *Jussive* or *Cohortative* in *Protasis*.

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
2 *Sam.*	xviii. 22.	Jussive,	2	*Prov.*	i. 23.	Jussive,	2
Ps.	xl. 6.	Perfect,	4		iv. 6.ᵃ	Imperfect,	2
	lxviii. 2.	Jussive,	2		xix. 25.	Imperfect,	2
	civ. 20.	Jussive,	2		xxvi. 26.	Jussive,	2
	cix. 25.	Imperfect,	2	*Job*	ix. 34.	Jussive,	2
	cxxxix. 9, 10.	Imperfect,	2		xv. 17.	Imperative,	2
	cxlvi. 4.	Jussive,	2		xx. 24.	Jussive,	2
	cxlvii. 18.ᵇ	Jussive,	2	*Is.*	xxvi. 10.	Perfect,	3

4.—With *Imperative* in *Protasis*.

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	xxx. 28.	Cohortative,	2	*Ps.*	xxi. 14.	Cohortative,	2
	xxxiv. 12.	Cohortative,	2		xxxiv. 12.	Jussive,	2
	xlii. 18.	Imperative,	2		l. 15.	Imperfect,	2
	xlii. 37.ᵇ	Imperfect,	2		li. 16.	Jussive,	2
Ex.	vii. 9.	Jussive.	2		lxxxvi. 11.ᵃ	Imperfect,	2
	xviii. 19.	Jussive.	2		cxviii. 19.	Imperfect,	2
1 *Kings*	xxii. 12.	Imperative,	2		cxix. 17.	Cohortative,	2
	xxii. 15.	Imperative,	2		cxix 145.	Cohortative,	2
2 *Kings*	v. 13.	Imperative,	2	*Prov.*	iii. 3, 4.	Imperative,	2
2 *Chron.*	xx. 20.ᵃ	Imperfect,	2		iii. 7.f	Jussive,	2
	xx. 20.ᵇ	Mod. Perfect,	2		iii. 9.f	Imperfect,	2
Job	i. 11.	Imperfect,	2		iii. 21.f	Imperfect,	2
	ii. 5.	Imperfect,	2		iv. 4.ᵇ	Imperative,	2
	xii. 7.	Jussive,	2		iv. 6.ᵇ	Imperfect,	2
	xii. 8.	Jussive,	2		iv. 8.	Imperfect,	2
	xxii. 21.	Imperative,	2		iv. 10.	Imperfect,	2
	xl. 32.	Imperative and			vi. 3.ᵃ	Imperative,	2
		Jussive,	2		vi. 3.ᵇ	Imperative,	2

4.—With *Imperative* in *Protasis.—Continued.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Prov.	vi. 6.b	Imperative,	2	*Is.*	viii. 9.	Imperatives (3),	2
	vii. 2.	Imperative,	2		viii. 10.	Jussive,	2
	ix. 6.	Imperative,	2		lv. 1, 3.	(1) Jussive,	2
	xiii. 20.	Imperative (k't),	2			(2) Cohortative,	2
	xvi. 3.	Imperfect,	2	*Jer.*	xvii. 14.a	Imperfect,	2
	xx. 22.	Imperfect,	2		xvii. 14.b	Cohortative,	2
	xxiii. 19.	Imperative,	2		xxv. 5.	Imperative,	2
	xxv. 5.	Imperfect,	2		xxxv. 15.	Imperative,	2
	xxvii. 11.a	Imperative,	2	*Amos*	v. 4.	Imperative,	2
	xxxi. 6.f	Jussive,	2		v. 6.	Imperative,	2

5.—With *Participle* in the *Protasis.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
1 *Sam.*	xvii. 34.	Perfect,	1	*Prov.*	xiii. 20.	Imperfect (q'ri),	2
2 *Sam.*	xvii. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	3		xiv. 31.a	Perfect,	1
2 *Kings*	vi. 5.	Mod. Imperfect,	1		xiv. 31.b	Perfect,	1
	vii. 2.	Imperfect,	4		xvii. 5.a	Perfect,	1
	vii. 19.	Imperfect,	4		xix. 17.	Perfect,	1

6.—With *Infinitive* with *Preposition* in *Protasis.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Ps.	iv. 5.	Imperfect,	2	*Lam.*	ii. 12.	Imperfect,	1
	xlii. 11.	Perfect,	1	*Ezek.*	iii. 18.	Imperfect,	2
	lxii. 10.	Verb omitted,	1		xii. 15.	Perfect,	2

II.

Condition Introduced by Waw.

1.—With *Imperfect* in the *Protasis.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Deut.	xxx. 8.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Ps.*	lxxvii. 4.a	Cohortative,	2
1 *Sam.*	ix. 7.	Imperfect,	2		lxxvii. 4.b	Cohortative,	2
	xx. 12.	Imperfect (Jussive force),	2		cxxxix. 11.	Verb omitted,	2
				Ezek.	xvi. 55.	Imperfect,	2

2.—With *Modified Perfect* in *Protasis.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	ix. 16.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Exod.*	xxxiii. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	1
	xxxiii. 13.	Mod. Perfect,	3		xxxiii. 23.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xlii. 38.	Mod. Perfect,	3	*Lev.*	xxii. 7.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xliv. 22.	Mod. Perfect,	3		xxvi. 41.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xliv. 29.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Num.*	x. 3–5.	Mod. Perfect,	2
Exod.	iii. 13.	Imperfect,	2		x. 17.	Mod. Perfect,	1
	iv. 14.	Mod. Perfect,	2		x. 21.	Mod. Perfect,	1
	xii. 13.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xiv. 15.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xii. 23.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xv. 39.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xiv. 3.f	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxi. 8.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxiii. 25.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Deut.*	iv. 29.a	Mod. Perfect,	2

2.—With *Modified Perfect* in *Protasis.—Continued.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Judg.	vii. 18.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Prov.*	vi. 22.	Imperfect,	2
1 *Sam.*	xxix. 10.	Imperative,	2		ix. 12.	Imperfect,	2
1 *Kings*	viii. 30.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Jer.*	vii. 27.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xvii. 12.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xviii. 8.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xviii. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	1		xviii. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2
Neh.	i. 9.	Imperfect,	2	*Ezek.*	iv. 6.	Mod. Perfect,	2
Job.	v. 24.b	Imperfect,	2		xvi. 53.	Verb omitted,	2
Prov.	iii. 24.	Perfect,	2		xviii. 10–13.	Mod. Perfect,	2

3.—With *Voluntative* in *Protasis.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Job.	xvi. 6.	Imperfect,	2	*Ps.* cxxxix. 8.	Verb omitted,	2

4.—With *Perfect* (not *Modified*) in *Protasis.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Ex.	xvi. 21.	Perfect,	1	*Job*	xxiii. 13.	Mod. Imperfect,	1
Lev.	x. 19.	Imperfect,	4	*Ezek.*	iii. 18.	Imperfect,	2
Num.	xii. 14.	Imperfect,	4		xxxiii. 3.	Imperfect,	2
Ruth	ii. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxxiii. 8.	Imperfect,	2
1 *Sam.*	xvii. 34.	Perfect,	1	*Nah.*	i. 12.	Imperfect,	2
Job.	x. 15.	Imperfect,	2				

5.—With *Modified Imperfect* in *Protasis.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Ex.	xiv. 23.	Participle,	2	2 *Sam.*	xviii. 16.	Mod. Imperfect,	1
1 *Sam.*	ii. 16.	Perfect,	3	*Ps.*	cvii. 25.	Mod. Imperfect,	1

6.—Waw with verb *omitted* in *Protasis.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	xliv. 26.	Mod. Perfect, (אַיִן in Protasis)	2	*Prov.*	iii. 28.	Jussive (יֵשׁ in Protasis)	2
Deut.	xiii. 15.	Imperfect,	2	*Ezek.*	xvii. 10.	Imperfect (Participle in Protasis),	3
Judges	vi. 13.	Perfect (יֵשׁ in Protasis),	4	*Am.*	iii. 4.	Imperfect (אַיִן in Protasis),	2
2 *Sam.*	xiii. 26.	Jussive,	2				
2 *Kings*	v. 17.	Jussive,	2				
	x. 15.	Imperative,	2				

III.

Condition Introduced by Particles—a. by אִם

1.—With *Imperfect* in *Protasis.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	iv. 7.ᵃ	Verb omitted,	2	*Levit.*	v. 1.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	iv. 7.ᵇ	Participle,	2		vii. 12.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xiii. 16.	Imperfect,	2		xii. 5.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xviii. 26.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xii. 8.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xviii. 28.	Imperfect,	2		xiii. 23.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xviii. 30.	Imperfect,	2		xiii. 28.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxiv. 8.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxvi. 3.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxviii. 17.	Second clause			xxvii. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2
		omitted,	2		xxvii. 18.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxviii. 30.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxvii. 19.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxx. 31.	Imperfect,	2	*Num.*	xvi. 29.	Perfect,	2
	xxxi. 8.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xvi. 30.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxxi. 50.	אִין	2		xix. 12.	Imperfect,	2
					xxi. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxxi. 52.	Verb omitted,	2		xxii. 18.	Imperfect,	3
	xxxii. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxx. 7.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xlii. 37.	Imperfect (Jus-			xxx. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	2
		sive force),	2		xxx. 13.	Imperfect,	2
Exod.	iv. 8.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxx. 15.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	iv. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxx. 16.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xix. 5.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxxii. 23.	Perfect,	2
	xx. 25.	Imperfect,	2		xxxiii. 55.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 3.ᵃ	Imperfect,	2		xxxvi. 4.	Imperfect,	2
	xxi. 3.ᵇ	Imperfect,	2	*Deut.*	viii. 19.	Perfect (cf. iv.	
	xxi. 4.	Imperfect,	2			25),	2
	xxi. 5.ᵇ	Mod. Perfect,	2		xi. 13.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 9.	Imperfect,	2		xi. 22.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 10.	Imperfect,	2		xi. 28.	Verb omitted,	2
	xxi. 11.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xv. 5.	Imperfect,	2
	xxi. 19.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xx. 12.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 21.	Imperfect,	2		xxii. 25.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 23.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxv. 7.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 27.	Imperfect,	2	*Joshua*	xxiii. 8.	v. s. כִּי־אִם	
	xxi. 30.	Mod. Perfect,	2				
	xxi. 32.	Imperfect,	2		xxiii. 12.	Imperfect (Jus-	
	xxii. 1.	Verb omitted,	2			sive force),	2
	xxii. 3.	Imperfect,	2	*Judges*	iv. 8.ᵃ	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxii. 6.	Imperfect,	2		iv. 8.ᵇ	Imperfect,	2
	xxii. 7.	Mod. Perfect,	2		vi. 37.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxii. 11.ᵃ	Imperfect,	2		xi. 10.	Imperfect,	2
	xxii. 11.ᵇ	Imperfect,	2		xiii. 16.	Imperfect (2),	2
	xxii. 22.	Imperfect,	2		xxi. 21.	Mod. Perfects,	2
	xxii. 24.	Imperfect,	2	*Ruth*	iii. 13.ᵃ	Imperfect (Jus-	
	xxii. 25.	Imperfect,	2			sive force),	2
	xxiii. 22.	Mod. Perfect,	2		iii. 13.ᵇ	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxxii. 32.	2d clause omit'd		*1 Sam.*	i. 11.	Mod. Perfect	
		by Aposiopesis,	2			and Impf.,	2
Levit.	iv. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2		vi. 9.	Verb omitted	
	iv. 13.	Mod. Perfect,	2			(cf. 2d clause),	2

1.—With *Imperfect* in *Protasis* after אִם.—*Continued.*

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
1 *Sam.* viii. 19.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xii. 25.	Imperfect,	2
xiv. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xiv. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xiv. 9.ᵃ	חֲלִילָה	2
xvii. 9.ᵃ	Mod. Perfect,	2
xvii. 9.ᵇ	Mod. Perfect,	2
xx. 7.	Imperative,	2
xx. 9.	Imperfect,	2
xx. 21.	Imperative,	2
xx. 22.	Imperative,	2
xxiv. 7.	חֲלִילָה	2
xxv. 22.	Imperfect (Jussive force),	2
2 *Sam.* iii. 35.	Imperfect (Jussive sense),	2
x. 11.	Mod. Perfect (2),	2
xv. 26.	הִנְנִי and Impf.,	2
xv. 34.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xviii. 3.	Imperfect (2),	2
xix. 14.	Imperfect (Jussive force),	2
xx. 20.	חֲלִילָה	2
1 *Kings* i. 52.	Imperfect,	2
viii. 25.	Imperfect,	2
ix. 4.	Mod. Perfect,	2
ix. 6.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xiii. 8.	Imperfect,	3
xx. 6.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xx. 10.	Imperfect (Jussive force),	2
xxii. 28.	Verb omitted (cf. 1 Sam.vi.9),	2
2 *Kings* ii. 10.	Jussive,	2
vi. 31.	Imperfect (Jussive force),	2
vii. 4.ᶜ	Imperfect,	2
vii. 4.ᵈ	Mod. Perfect,	
xx. 19.	Verb omitted,	1
xxi. 8.	Imperfect,	2
1 *Chron.* iv. 10.	Second clause omitted,	2
xxii. 13.	Imperfect,	2
2 *Chron.* vi. 16.	Imperfect,	2
vii. 13.	Imperfect,	2
vii. 19.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xxxiii. 8.	Imperfect,	2
Neh. i. 19.	Imperfect and Mod. Perfect,	2
ii. 5.	Imperfect,	2

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Esther iv. 14.	Imperfect,	2
Job viii. 5, 6.	Imperfect,	3
viii. 18.	Mod. Perfect,	2
ix. 3.	Imperfect,	3
ix. 20.	Imperfect,	2
ix. 23.	Imperfect,	2
xi. 10.	Imperfect,	1
xiii. 10.	Imperfect,	2
xiv. 7.	Imperfect,	1
xiv. 14.	Imperfect,	2
xvi. 6.*	Imperfect,	1
xvii. 13.	Verb omitted,	1
xix. 5.	Imperative,	2
xx. 12, 14.	Participle,	3
xx. 6.	Imperfect,	3
xxii. 23.	Imperfect,	2
xxvii. 5.	חֲלִילָה	2
xxvii. 14.	Verb omitted,	1
xxvii. 16, 17.	Imperfect,	2
xxxi. 7, 8.	Cohortative and Jussive,	2
xxxi. 13, 14.	Imperfect,	2
xxxi. 16, 17.	Apodosis wanting,	2
xxxi. 19.	Apodosis wanting,	2
xxxi. 25.	Verb (or perhaps second clause)om't'd,	2
xxxi. 38.	Jusssive,	2
xxxiii. 5.	Imperative,	2
xxxiv. 14.	Imperfect,	2
xxxvi. 11.	Imperfect,	2
xxxvi. 12.	Imperfect,	2
Psalms vii. 13.	Imperfect,	2
xxvii. 3.ᵃ	Imperfect,	2
xxvii. 3.ᵇ	Participle,	2
l. 12.	Imperfect,	2
lix. 16.	Mod. Imperfect,	2
lxviii. 14.	Verb omitted,	1
lxxxi. 9.	Cohortative,	2
lxxxix. 31–3.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xcv. 7, 8.	Jussive (acc. to Mas. pointing, verb omitted),	2
cxxvii. 1.	Perfect (2),	1
cxxx. 3.	Imperfect,	2
cxxxii. 12.	Imperfect,	2
cxxxvii. 5.	Jussive,	2

* Cohortative in Protasis.

1.—With *Imperfect* in *Protasis* after אִם.—*Continued.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Ps.	cxxxvii. 6.	Jussive,	2	*Jer.*	iv. 1.ᵃ	Jussive,	2
	cxxxviii. 7.	Imperfect,	2		iv. 1.ᵇ	Imperfect,	2
	cxxxix. 8ᵃ.	Verb omitted,	3		v. 2.	Imperfect,	2
	cxxxix. 8.ᵇ	Verb omitted,	3		vii. 5, 7.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	cxxxix. 19.	Second clause			xii. 17.	Mod. Perfect,	2
		omitted,	1		xv. 1.	אֵין	4
Prov.	ii. 1–5.	Imperfect,	2				
	iii. 24.	Imperfect,	2		xvii. 27.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	iii. 34.	Imperfect,	1		xxii. 4.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	iv. 12.	Imperfect,	2		xxii. 5.	Perfect (cf.	
	iv. 16.ᵃ	Imperfect,	2			Deut. iv. 25),	2
	iv. 16.ᵇ	Participle,	2		xxii. 24.	Imperfect,	4
	xix. 19.	Imperfect,	2		xxiii. 38.	Mod. Perfect,	1
	xxiv. 11.	Imperfect,	2		xxxi. 36.	Imperfect,	4
Eccl.	iv. 10.ᵃ	Imperfect,	1		xxxi. 37.	Imperfect,	4
	iv. 11.	Mod. Perfect,	1		xxxviii. 17.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	iv. 12.	Imperfect,	1		xxxviii. 18.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	v. 11.	Verb omitted,	1		xlii. 5.	Jussive,	2
	vi. 3.	Verb omitted,	4		xlii. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	x. 4.	Jussive,	2		xlii. 15.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	x. 11.	אֵין	2	*Ezek.*	ii. 5.	Mod. Perfect,	2
					ii. 7.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xi. 3.ᵃ	Imperfect,	1		iii. 11.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xi. 8.	Imperfect (Jus-			xxxii. 22.	Imperfect,	2
		sive force),	2		xliv. 25.	Imperfect,	2
Cant.	v. 8.	Imperfect,	2	*Hosea*	ix. 12.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	viii. 7.	Imperfect,	3	*Amos*	v. 22.	Imperfect,	3
Isaiah	i. 18.	Imperfect (2),	3		vi. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	i. 19.	Imperfect,	2		ix. 2.ᵃ	Imperfect,	3
	i. 20.	Imperfect,	2		ix. 2.ᵇ	Imperfect,	3
	vii. 9.	Imperfect,	2		ix. 3.ᵃ	Imperfect,	3
	viii. 20.	Imperfect,	4		ix. 3.ᵇ	Imperfect,	3
	x. 22.	Imperfect,	4	*Obad.*	4.	Imperfect,	4
	xxi. 12.	Imperative,	2	*Hab.*	ii. 3.ᵇ	Imperative,	2
Jer.	ii. 22.	Participle,	4	*Zech.*	vi. 15.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	ii. 28.	Jussive,	2	*Mal.*	ii. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2

2.—With *Perfect* in *Protasis* after אִם

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	xviii. 3.	Jussive,	2	*Gen.*	xliii. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxiv. 19.	Imperfect,	2		xlvii. 6.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxiv. 33.	Imperfect,	2		xlvii. 16.	Imperative,	2
	xxviii. 15.	Imperfect,	2		xlvii. 18.	Imperfect,	2
	xxx. 27.	2d clause omit'd			xlvii. 29.	Imperative,	2
		by Aposiopesis,	2		l. 4.	Imperative,	2
	xxxii. 27.	Imperfect,	2	*Ex.*	xxii. 2.	Verb omitted,	2
	xxxiii. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxxiii. 13.	Imperative,	2
	xxxviii. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	1		xxxiv. 9.	Jussive,	2
	xl. 14.	Mod. Perfect,		*Lev.*	xxii. 6.	Imperfect,	2
		(with Jussive			xxv. 28.	Mod. Perfect,	2
		force) and Im-		*Num.*	v. 19.	Imperative,	2
		perative,	2		v. 27.	Mod. Perfect,	2

2.—With *Perfect* in *Protasis* after אִם.—*Continued.*

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Num. v. 28.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xi. 15.b	Imperative,	2
xv. 24.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xxi. 9.	Verb omitted,	2
xxii. 20.	Imperative,	2
xxx. 6.	Imperfect,	2
xxxii. 17.	Imperfect,	2
xxxv. 16.	Verb omitted,	2
xxxv. 17.	Verb omitted,	2
xxxv. 22–24.	Mod. Perfect,	2
Deut. xxi. 14.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xxii. 20.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xxxii. 30.	Imperfect,	2
xxxii. 41.	Imperfects,	2
Josh. xxii. 24.	Second clause omitted,	2
Judges vi. 3.	Mod. Perfect,	2
ix. 16–19.	Imperative,	2
xv. 7.	Imperfect,	2
Ruth ii. 21.	Jussive,	2
iii. 18.	Imperfect,	2
1 *Sam.* xxvi. 19.	Jussive,	2
2 *Sam.* xv. 33.	Mod. Perfect,	2
1 *Kings* xx. 18.	Jussive,	2
2 *Kings* iv. 24.	Jussive,	2
vii. 4.a	Mod. Perfect,	2
4.b	Mod. Perfect,	2
v. 20.	Mod. Perfect,	2
1 *Chron.* xii.17.a	Imperfect,	2
Esther v. 8.	Jussive,	2
viii. 5.	Jussive,	2
Job vii. 4.	Perfect,	1
ix. 15.	Imperfect,	4
ix. 16.	Imperfect,	4
ix. 30.	Imperfect,	3
x. 14.	Mod. Perfect,	2
x. 15.a	אוּלַי?	2
x. 15.b	Imperfect,	2
xi. 13, 15.	Imperfects,	2
xxi. 6.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xxii. 20.	Perfect,	1
xxxi. 5, 6.	Cohortative,	2
xxxi. 20–22.	Jussive,	2
xxxi. 39, 40.	Jussive,	2
xxxv. 6.	Imperfect,	3
xxxv. 7.	Imperfect,	3
Ps. vii. 4, 5.	Jussives,	2

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Ps. xli. 7.	Imperfect,	1
xliv. 21.	Imperfect,	2
l. 18.	Mod.Imperfect,	1
lxiii. 17.	Imperfect,	2
lxvi. 18.	Imperfect,	2
lxxiii. 15.	Perfect,	4
lxxviii. 34.	Perfect,	1
xciv. 18.	Imperfect,	1
Prov. ix. 12.a	Perfect,	2
ix. 12.b	Imperfect,	2
xxiv. 14.	רְשׁ	2
xxv. 21.	Imperative (2),	2
xxx. 32.	Verb omitted,	2
Eccl. x. 10.	Imperfect,	2
Isaiah iv. 34.*	Mod. Perfect,	2
vi. 11.	Clause omitted,	2
xxiv. 13.	Verb omitted,	2
xxviii. 25.	Mod. Perfect,	1
xxx. 17.	Imperfect,	2
xl. 7.	Perfect,	1
lv. 10, 11.	Imperfect (2),	2
lxv. 6.	Mod. Perfect,	2
Jer. xiv. 7.	Imperative,	2
xiv. 18.	Verb omitted,	2
xxiii. 22.	Imperfect,	4
xxxvii. 10,	Imperfect,	4
xlviii. 27.	NewConditional Clause with Perfect,	1
xlix. 9.a	Imperfect,	3
xlix. 9.b	Perfect,	3
Lam. iii. 22.	Mod. Perfect,	3
Ezek. iii. 6.	Imperfect,	4
xxxv. 6.	Imperfect,	2
Amos. iii. 4.	Imperfect,	2
iii. 7.	Imperfect,	1
vii. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	1
Obad. 5.a	†Imperfect,	3
5.b	Imperfect,	3
Micah v. 7.	Mod. Perfect,	2

* In Protasis we have the unusual construction of a Perfect followed by an Imperfect with the same force.

† Cf. *Jer.* xlix. 9.

3.—With *Participle* in *Protasis* after אִם

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	xx. 7.	Imperative,	2	*Judg.*	ix. 15.	Imperative,	2
	xxiv. 42.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xi. 9.	Imperfect,	2
	xxiv. 49.	Imperative,	2	1 *Sam.*	xi. 3.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xliii. 5.	Imperfect,	2		xix. 11.	Participle,	2
Exod.	viii. 17.	Participle,	2	2 *Chron.* xxv. 8.		Imperative,	2
	ix. 2.f	Participle,	2	*Job*	xiv. 5.	Imperative,	2
	xxxiii. 15.	Jussive,	2		xxxi. 9, 10.	Jussive,	2
Levit.	iii. 1.	Imperfect,	2		xxxvi. 8.	Imperfect,	2
	iii. 7.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Jer.*	xxvi. 15.	Participle,	2
Num.	xi. 15.	Imperative,	2		xlii. 15.	Imperative,	2
Judg. vi. 36, 37.		Mod. Perfect,	2				

4.—Without any Verb in *Protasis* after אִם—(a) With יֵשׁ or אֵין

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	xxx. 1.	Participle,	2	*Judg.*	ix. 20.	Jussive,	2
	xliv. 26.	Mod. Perfect,	2	1 *Sam.*	xiv. 39.	Imperfect,	4
Exod.	xxii. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2	2 *Sam.*	xvii. 6.	Imperative,	2
	xxxii. 32.b	Imperative,	2	2 *Kings*	ii. 10.	Imperfect,	2
Num.	v. 8.	Participle,	2	*Job* xxxiii. 23.		Mod. Imperfect,	3
	xxvii. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxxiii. 32.	Imperative,	2
	xxvii. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxxiii. 33.	Imperative,	2
	xxvii. 11.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Prov.*	xxii. 27.	Imperfect,	2
Judg.	ix. 15.	Jussive,	2				

4. (b)—Verb omitted in *Protasis* after אִם

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	xiii. 9.	Cohortative,	2	2 *Chron.*	ii. 5.	Verb omitted,	1
	xviii. 21.	Imperfect,	2	*Neh.*	ii. 7.	Jussive,	2
	xxiii. 13.	Perfect,	2	*Esther*	i. 19.	Jussive,	2
	xlii. 16.	Cl. ommitted,	2		iii. 9.	Jussive,	2
	xliii. 11.	Imperative,	2		v. 4.	Jussive,	2
Exod.	i. 16.	Mod. Perfect,	2		vi. 13.	Imperfect,	2
	xix. 13.	Imperfect,	2		vii. 3.	Jussive,	2
Lev.	iii. 1.	Verb omitted,	2		viii. 5.	Jussive,	2
	xv. 23.	Imperfect,	2		ix. 13.	Jussive,	2
	xxv. 51.	Imperfect,	2	*Job*	ix. 19.	Imperfect (2),	2
	xxvii. 3.	Mod. Perfect,	2		ix. 24.	Verb omitted,	2
	xxvii. 4.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xi. 14.	Imperative,	2
	xxvii. 6.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xvii. 16.	Imperfect,	2
	xxvii. 9.	Imperfect,	2		xxi. 4.	Imperfect,	4
	xxvii. 11.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxiv. 25.	Imperfect,	2
Josh.	xxii. 19.	Imperative,	2		xxx. 24.	Imperfect,	1
	xxii. 22.	Jussive,	2		xxxiv. 16.	Imperative,	2
	xxii. 23.	Jussive,	2		xxxvii. 13.	Imperfect,	1
	xxiv. 15.	Imperative,	2	*Prov.*	xxiii. 2.	Mod. P'rf't (Jussive sense),	2
1 *Sam.*	ii. 16.	Perfect,	2				
	vi. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Jer.*	xl. 4.	Imperative,	2
	xv. 7.	Verb omitted,	1	*Hosea*	iv. 15.	Jussive,	2
	xxvi. 19.b	Participle,	2		xii. 12.	Perfect,	1
2 *Sam.*	xii. 8.	Cohortative,	4	*Nahum.*	i. 12.	Perfect,	2
1 *Chron.* xii. 17.b		Jussive,	2	*Zech.*	xi. 12.	Imperative (2),	2
	xv. 2.	Verb omitted,	1	*Mal.*	i. 6.	Verb omitted,	3

4. (c)—Verb omitted in *Protasis* after כִּי־אִם=*Except, Save.*

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Gen. xxxix. 6.	Perfect,	1	2 Kings v. 17.	Imperfect,	2
xxxix. 9.	Perfect,	1	ix. 35.	Perfect,	1
xlii. 15.	Imperfect,	2	xiii. 7.	Perfect,	1
Ex. x. 4.	Participle,	2	1 Chron. ii. 34.	Perfect,	1
Num. xxvi. 33.	Perfect,	1	xxiii. 22.	Perfect,	1
xxvi. 65.	Perfect,	1	2 Chr. xviii. 30.	Imperfect,	2
xxxv. 33.	Imperfect,	1	xxi. 17.	Perfect,	2
xiv. 30.	Imperfect,	2	xxiii. 6.	Jussive,	2
Deut. x. 12.	Participle,	1	Neh. ii. 12.	אֵין	1
Josh. xiv. 4.	Perfect,	1			
xvii. 3.	Perfect,	1	Esther ii. 15.	Perfect,	1
1 Sam. xxx. 17.	Perfect,	1	v. 12.	Perfect,	1
xxx. 22.	Imperfect,	2	Prov. xviii. 2.	Imperfect,	1
2 Sam. xii. 3.	אֵין	1	Eccl. iii. 12.	אֵין	1
xix. 29.	Perfect,	1	viii. 15.	אֵין	1
1 Kings xvii. 1.	Imperfect,	2	Jer. iii. 10.	Perfect,	1
xvii. 12.	יֵשׁ	2	xxii. 17.	אֵין	1
xxii. 31.	Imperfect,	2	xliv. 14.	Imperfect,	2
2 Kings iv. ii.	אֵין	1	Dan. x. 21.	אֵין	1
v. 15.	אֵין	1	Micah vi. 8.	Perfect,	1

4. (d)—With Ellipsis of *First Clause* after כִּי־אִם=*But.*

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Gen. xv. 4.	Imperfect,	2	Psalms i. 4.	Verb omitted,	1
xxxv. 10.	Imperfect,	2	Prov. xxiii. 17.	Verb omitted,	2
Lev. xxi. 2.	Imperfect,	2	Is. xxxiii. 21.	Verb omitted,	2
xxi. 14.	Imperfect,	2	xxxvii. 19.	Verb omitted,	1
Num. x. 30.	Imperfect,	2	lix. 2.	Perfect,	1
Deut. vii. 5.	Imperfect,	2	lxv. 18.	Imperative,	2
xii. 5.	Imperfect,	2	Jer. vii. 23.	Perfect,	1
xii. 14.	Imperfect,	2	vii. 32.	Verb omitted,	2
xii. 18.	Imperfect,	2	ix. 23.	Imperfect,	2
xvi. 6.	Imperfect,	2	xvi. 15.	Verb omitted,	2
Josh. xxiii. 8.	Imperfect,	2	xix. 6.	Verb omitted,	2
1 Sam. ii. 15.	Verb omitted,	2	xx. 3.	Verb omitted,	2
viii. 19.	Imperfect,	2	xxiii. 8.	Verb omitted,	2
xxi. 2.	Verb omitted,	1	xxxi. 30.	Imperfect,	2
1 Kings viii. 19.	Imperfect,	2	xxxviii. 4.	Verb omitted,	1
xxiii. 8.	Verb omitted,	1	xxxviii. 6.	Verb omitted,	1
xxiii. 18.	Verb omitted,	1	xxxix. 12.	Imperfect,	2
2 Kings xiv. 6.	Imperfect,	2	Ezek. xii. 23.	Imperative,	2
xvii. 36.	Imperfect,	2	xxxiii. 11.	Verb omitted,	2
xvii. 39.	Imperfect,	2	xxxvi. 22.	Verb omitted,	1
xvii. 40.	Participle,	1	xliv. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xix. 18.	Verb omitted,	1	xliv. 22.	Imperfect,	2
xxiii. 9.	Perfect,	1	xliv. 25.	Imperfect,	2
xxiii. 23.	Imperfect,	1	Amos viii. 11.	Verb omitted,	2
Job xlii. 8.	Imperfect,	2	Zech. iv. 6.	Verb omitted,	2
Psalms i. 2.	Verb omitted,	1			

5.—In Asseverations and Denials, the *Apodosis* being understood as a *Jussive*, after כִּי־אִם ‏, אִם לֹא ‏, אִם

Passage.	Protasis.	Class.
Gen. xiv. 23.	Imperfect,	2
xxi. 23.	Imperfect,	2
xxiv. 38.	Imperfect,	2
xxvi. 29.	Imperfect,	2
xlii. 15.	Imperfect,	2
Exod. xxii. 7.	Perfect,	2
Num. xiv. 28.	Imperfect,	2
xiv. 29.	Imperfect,	2
xiv. 35.	Imperfect,	2
xxiv. 22.	Imperfect,	2
Deut. i. 25.	Imperfect,	2
Josh. xiv. 9.	Imperfect,	2
Judg. v. 8.	Imperfect,	2
1 *Sam.* iii. 14.	Imperfect,	2
xvii. 55.	Perfect,	2
xix. 6.	Imperfect,	2
xxiv. 22.	Imperfect,	2
xxv. 34.	Perfect,	2
xxviii. 10.	Imperfect,	2
xxx. 15.	Imperfect (2),	2
2 *Sam.* xi. 11.	Imperfect,	2
xiv. 11.	Imperfect,	2
1 *Kings* i. 51.	Imperfect,	2
xvii. 1.	Imperfect,	2
xx. 23.	Imperfect,	2
xx. 25.	Imperfect,	2
2 *Kings* ii. 2.	Imperfect,	2
ii. 4.	Imperfect,	2
ii. 6.	Imperfect,	2
iii. 14.	Imperfect,	2
iv. 30.	Imperfect,	2
ix. 26.	Perfect (of past time),	2
Neh. xiii. 25.	Imperfect,	2
Job i. 11.	Imperfect,	2
ii. 5.	Imperfect,	2
xvii. 2.	Verb omitted,	2
xxx. 25.	Imperfect,	2
xxxi. 29.	Imperfect,	2
xxxi. 31.	Perfect,	2
xxxi. 33.	Perfect,	2
xxxi. 36.	Imperfect,	2

Passage.	Protasis.	Class.
Job xxxvi. 29.	Imperfect,	2
Psalms xcv. 11.	Imperfect,	2
cxxxi. 2.	Perfects (present),	2
cxxxii. 3.	Imperfect,	2
cxxxii. 4.	Imperfect,	2
Cant. ii. 7.	Imperfect,	2
iii. 5.	Imperfect,	2
Isaiah v. 9.	Imperfect,	2
xiv. 24.	Perfect (fut.),	2
xxii. 14.	Imperfect,	2
lxii. 8.	Imperfect,	2
Jer. xv. 11.	Perfect (fut.),	2
xxii. 6.	Imperfect,	2
l. 45.	Imperfect,	2
li. 14.	Perfect,	2
Ezek. v. 11.	Imperfect,	2
xiv. 16.	Imperfect,	2
xiv. 20.	Imperfect,	2
xvii. 16.	Imperfect,	2
xvii. 19.	Verb omitted,	2
xviii. 3.	Imperfect,	2
xx. 3.	Imperfect,	2
xx. 23.	Imperfect,	2
xx. 31.	Imperfect,	2
xxi. 18.	Imperfect,	2
xxxiii. 11.	Imperfect,	2
xxxiii. 27.	Imperfect,	2
xxxiv. 8.	Verb omitted,	2
xxxvi. 5.	Perfect,	2
xxxvi. 7.	Imperfect,	2
xxxviii. 19.	Imperfect,	2

Besides these forms, יֵשׁ may stand in *Protasis*.

Passage.	Protasis.	Class.
2 *Sam.* xiv. 19.	יֵשׁ=יֵשׁ־אֵשׁ	2
1 *Kgs.* xvii. 12.	וְיֵשׁ	2
xviii. 10.	וְיֵשׁ	2
Prov. xxiii. 18.	וְיֵשׁ	2

6.—With *Infinitive Construct* in *Apodosis* after אִם

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
2 *Sam.*	iii. 13.	Imperfect,	2	*Job*	ix. 27, 28.	Perfect,	1
	v. 6.	Imperfect,	2				

b.—After כִּי=*if, when, since.* 1. With *Imperfect* in *Protasis.*

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	iv. 12.	Imperfect,	2	*Levit.*	xxii. 29.	Imperfect,	2
	iv. 24.	Verb omitted,	2		xxiii. 10.	Imperfect,	2
	xii. 12.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxv. 25.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxiv. 41.	Imperfect,	2		xxv. 35.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxxii. 18.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Num.*	v. 6.	Mod. Perfect,	2
Exod.	i. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2		v. 12.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	vii. 9.	Mod. Perfect,	2		ix. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xii. 25.	Mod. Perfect,	2		x. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xii. 26.	Mod. Perfect,	2		x. 32.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xiii. 14.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xv. 14.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xviii. 16.	Participle,	1		xxvii. 8.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 1.	Imperfect,	1		xxx. 3	Imperfect,	2
	xxi. 7.	Imperfect,	2		xxx. 4.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 14.	Imperfect,	2		xxxii. 15.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 18.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Deut.*	iv. 25.	Inserted clause in place of regular Apodosis,	2
	xxi. 20.	Imperfect,	2				
	xxi. 22.	Imperfect,	2		iv. 29.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 26.	Imperfect,	2		vi. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 28.	Imperfect,	2		vi. 20.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxi. 33.	Imperfect,	2		vi. 25.	Imperfect,	2
	xxi. 37.	Imperfect,	2		vii. 1.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxii. 4.	Imperfect,	2		vii. 17.	Imperfect,	2
	xxii. 6.	Imperfect,	2		xiii. 13.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxii. 9.	Imperfect,	2		xiv. 24.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxii. 13.	Imperfect,	2		xv. 7.	Imperfects,	2
	xxii. 26.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xv. 16.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxx. 12.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xviii. 6.	Mod. Perfect,	2
Levit.	i. 2.	Imperfect,	2		xix. 16.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	ii. 1.	Imperfect,	2		xx. 19.	Imperfect,	2
	iv. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxi. 22.	Imperfect,	2
	v. 1.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxii. 28.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	v. 3.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxiv. 7.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	v. 15.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxviii. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	vii. 21.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxviii. 13.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xii. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxxi. 21.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xiii. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Josh.*	viii. 5.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xiii. 16.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xx. 5.	Imperfect,	2
	xiii. 24.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xxii. 28.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xiii. 31.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Judg.*	xxi. 22.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xiii. 42.	Mod. Perfect,	2	1 *Sam.*	x. 7.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xv. 13.	Mod. Perfect,	2		xx. 13.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xix. 33.	Imperfect,	2		xxi. 10.	Imperative,	2
	xx. 27.	Imperfect,	2	1 *Kings*	viii. 35.	Inf. with בְּ	1
	xxi. 9.	Imperfect,	2		viii. 37.	Jussive,	2
	xxii. 11.	Imperfect,	2		viii. 44.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxii. 12.	Imperfect,	2		viii. 46.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xxii. 27.	Mod. Perfect,	2				

Imperfect in *Protasis* after כִּי.—*Continued.*

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
2 *Kings* iv. 29.	Imperfect,	2
vii. 12.	*Impft. with וְ	2
xviii. 22.	2d clause om'd,	2
xviii. 32.	Jussive,	2
2 *Chron.* vi. 28.	Jussive,	2
vi. 34.	Mod. Perfect,	2
vi. 36.	Mod. Perfect,	2
Job iii. 22.	Imperfect,	2
v. 21.	Imperfect,	2
xiii. 19.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xix. 28, 29.	Imperative,	2
xxvii. 8.	Verb omitted,	1
xxvii. 9.	Imperfect,	2
xxxi. 14.a	Imperfect,	2
xxxi. 14.b	Imperfect,	2
xxxvi. 27.	Imperfect,	1
xxxvi. 31.	Imperfect,	1
xxxviii. 40.	Imperfect,	1
xxxviii. 41.	Imperfect,	1
Psalms ii. 12.	Imperative,	2
viii. 4.	V. 5 takes place of regular Apodosis,	1
xxiii. 4.	Imperfect,	3
xxxvii. 24.	Imperfect,	3
xli. 12.	Perfect,	1
xlix. 17.	Jussive,	2
xlix. 18, 19.a	Imperfect,	3
xlix. 19.b	Imperfect,	2
lxii. 11.	Jussive,	2
lxxi. 23.	Imperfect,	2
lxxiii. 21.	Imperfect,	2
lxxv. 3.	Imperfect,	2
cii. 1.	Verb omitted,	1
cxxvii. 5.	Imperfect,	2
Prov. ii. 10.	Imperfect,	2
iii. 25.	Jussive,	2
iv. 3.	Imperfect,	2
vi. 30.	Imperfect,	1
xxii. 6.	Imperfect,	2
xxiii. 13.	Imperfect,	2
xxiii. 31.	Jussive,	2
xxiv. 12.	Imperfects,	2
xxvi. 25.	Jussive,	2
xxx. 22.	Verb omitted,	2

* Very unusual construction.

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Isaiah i. 12.	Perfect,	1
i. 15.	Partic. with אֵין	2
iii. 6.	Imperfect,	2
viii. 19.	2d clause om'd,	2
xvi. 12.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xxvi. 9.b	Perfect,	2
xxxvi. 7.	2d clause om'd,	2
xxx. 21.a	Imperative,	2
xxx. 21.b	Imperative,	2
xliii. 2.a	Verb omitted, and Imperfect,	2
xliii. 2.b	Imperfect,	2
lx. 5.	Imperfect,	2
Jer. ii. 26.	Verb omitted,	1
v. 19.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xii. 1.	Verb omitted,	1
xii. 6.	Jussive,	2
xiii. 22.	2d clause om'd,	2
xiv. 12.a	Partic. with אֵין	2
xiv. 12.b	Partic. with אֵין	2
xv. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xvii. 6.	Imperfect,	2
xxxviii. 25.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xlix. 16.	Imperfect,	3
li. 53.	Imperfect,	3
Lam. iii. 8.	Perfect,	1
Ezek. xiv. 9.a	Perfect (follow'd by Mod. Perfects,)	2
xiv. 12.	Mod. Perfect,	2
xviii. 5.	Imperfect,	2
xviii. 21.	Imperfects,	2
xxxiii. 2.	Imperfect,	1
xxxiii. 6.	Perfect,	1
xlvi. 17.	Mod. Perfect,	2
Hosea iv. 14.	Imperfect,	2
viii. 7.	Imperfect,	2
viii. 11.	Imperfect,	2
Micah v. 4.	Mod. Perfect,	2
vii. 8.b	Verb omitted,	2
Hab. i. 5.b	Imperfect,	3
Zech. vii. 6.	Verb omitted,	1
viii. 6.	Imperfect,	3
Mal i. 4.	Perfect,	1
i. 8.	אֵין (2),	1

2.—*Perfect* in *Protasis* after כִּי

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Gen.	vi. 1.	Mod. Imp'fects,	1	*Job*	xxix. 11.	Mod.Imperfect,	1
	xxxi. 15.	Perfect,	1		xxxiv. 33.	Imperfect,	3
	xlix. 6.	Jussive,	2	*Psalms*	xxi. 12.	Imperfect,	1
Exod.	xiii. 15.	Mod.Imperfect,	1		xxxii. 3.	Perfect,	1
Num.	v. 20.	2d clause om'd,	2		lviii. 11.	Imperfect,	2
	xxii. 22.	Mod.Imperfect,	1		ciii. 16.	אֵין	2
Josh.	xvii. 13.	Mod.Imperfect,	1				
Judg.	i. 28.	Mod.Imperfect,	1		cxix. 83.	Perfect,	2
	ii. 18.	Perfect,	1	*Isaiah*	xliii. 20.	Imperfect,	2
	vi. 7.	Mod.Imperfect,	1	*Jer.*	xii. 5.	Imperfect,	2
	xvi. 16.	Mod.Imperfect,	1		xxxi. 25.	Imperfect,	2
Ruth	i. 12.	Imperfect,	4	*Ezek.*	iii. 19.	Perfect,	2
1 *Sam.*	i. 12.	Perfect,	1		xiv. 22.	2d clause om'd,	2
2 *Sam.*	vii. 1.	Mod.Imperfect,	1		xxxiii. 9.	Perfect,	2
	xix. 26.	Mod.Imperfect,	1	*Hosea*	ix. 19.	Imperfect,	2
Neh.	ix. 18.	Perfect,	1	*Micah*	vii. 8.[a]	Perfect,	2
Job	vii. 13.	Mod. Perfect,	1	*Nah.*	i. 14.	Imperfect,	2
	xxii. 29.	Imperfect,	2	*Zech.*	vii. 5.	Perfect,	1

3.—*Participle* in *Protasis* after כִּי

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Num.	xxxiv. 2.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Deut.*	xviii. 9.	Imperfect,	2
	xxxv. 10.	Mod. Perfect,	2	*Jer.*	xliv. 19.	Perfect,	1

4.—Without any verb expressed in *Protasis*.

(*a*) Verb omitted.   (*b*) יֵשׁ

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
Josh.	xvii. 18.	Imperfect,	3	*Prov.*	xix. 18.	Imperative,	2
1 *Kgs.*	xviii. 27.	Imperative,	2				
Job	xxxvi. 18.	Jussive,	2				
Prov.	xxiii. 22.	Jussive,	2				
Hosea	xi. 1,	Mod.Imperfect,	2				

c.—*Condition Introduced by* אִם

1.—*Imperfect* in *Protasis*.   2.—*Perfect* in *Protasis*.

Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.	Passage.		Apodosis.	Class.
1 *Sam.*	xx. 10.	Imperfect,	2	*Exod.*	ii. 36.	Imperfect,	2
Ezek.	xiv. 17.	Imperfect,	2	*Levit.*	xxv. 49.	Mod. Perfect,	2
	xiv. 19.	Imperfect,	2				

d.—Condition Introduced by אִלּוּ, לוּלֵי, לוּ

(d) 1.—With *Imperfect* in *Protasis*.   2.—With *Jussive* or *Imperative* in *Protasis*.

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Gen. xvii. 18.	2d clause om'd,	4
l. 15.	Imperfect,	4
Deut. xxxii. 27.	Imperfect,	4
Job vi. 2.	2d clause om'd,	4
Ezek. xiv. 15.	Imperfect,	4

Note.—Perhaps 1 *Sam*. xx. 14 belongs here, reading וְלוּ for וְלֹא

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Gen. xxiii. 13.	2d clause om'd,	4
*xxx. 34.	2d clause om'd,	4

Note.—Perhaps 1 *Sam*. xiii. 23 belongs here reading וְלוּ for וְלֹא

---

* In these and similar passages לוּ has come to be equal to a particle of wishing=*utinam*. Perhaps verb in Job vi. 2 should be considered a *Jussive*.

3.—With *Perfect* in *Protasis* after לוּ or its compounds.

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Gen. xxxi. 42.	Perfect,	4
xliii. 10.	Perfect,	4
Num. xiv. 2.	(2) 2d clause omitted,	4
xx. 3.	2d clause om'd,	4
Deut. xxxii. 29.	Imperfect,	4
Josh. vii. 7.	2d clause om'd,	4
Judges viii. 19.	Perfect,	4
xiii. 23.	Perfect,	4
xiv. 18.	Perfect,	4
1 *Sam*. xiv. 30.	Verb omitted,	4
xxv. 34.	Perfect,	4
2 *Sam*. ii. 27.	Perfect,	4

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Esther vii. 4.	Perfect (אִלּוּ),	4
Ps. xxvii. 13.	2d clause om'd,	4
xciv. 17.	Perfect,	4
cvi. 23.	Mod. Imperfect,	4
cxix. 92.	Perfect,	4
cxxiv. 1.	Perfect,	4
cxxiv. 2.	Perfect,	4
Eccl. vi. 6.	Perft. (אִלּוּ),	4
Isaiah i. 9.	Perfect,	4
xlviii. 18.	Mod. Imperfect,	4
lxiii. 19.	2d clause om'd,	4
Micah ii. 4.	Mod. Perfect,	4

4.—With *Participle* in *Protasis*.

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
2 *Sam*. xviii. 2.	(q'ri) Impft.,	4
2 *Kings* iii. 14.	Imperfect (after אִם neg.),	4
Ps. lxxxi. 14.	Imperfect,	4

5.—With *verb omitted* in *Protasis*.

Passage.	Apodosis.	Class.
Num. xxii. 7.	Perfect (יֵשׁ)	4
2 *Sam*. xix. 7.	(q'ri) Verb omitted,	4
Job xvi. 4.	Imperfect (יֵשׁ)	4

Note.—In *Num*. xxii. 33 we have אוּלַי in the sense of לוּלֵי with *Perfect* in both clauses. It is probably a textual error for the latter word. Ct. Ewald, Lehrbuch, 805. Note 2.

GENERAL SUMMARY.

VERBAL FORM.			No. of Instances	I.	II.	III.	IV.
Imperfect in *Protasis* after אִם			243	17	201	16	8
"	"	" כִּי	182	21	154	7	o
"	"	" אוֹ	3	o	3	o	o
"	"	" לוּ	5	o	o	o	5
"	"	" ו	7	o	7	o	o
"	" alone,		33	9	18	5	1
Total No. instances of *Imperfect*,			473	47	383	28	14
Perfect in *Protasis* after אִם			109	12	82	8	7
"	"	" כִּי	35	19	14	1	1
"	"	" אוֹ	2	o	2	o	o
"	"	" לוּ	24	o	o	o	24
"	"	" ו	11	3	6	o	2
"	" alone,		53	26	15	6	6
Total No. instances of *Perfect*,			234	60	119	15	40
Participle in *Protasis* after אִם			21	o	21	o	o
"	"	" כִּי	4	1	3	o	o
"	"	" לוּ	3	o	o	o	3
"	"	" ו	1	o	o	1	o
"	" alone,		10	6	2	o	2
Total No. instances of *Participle*,			39	7	26	1	5

Verbal Form.	No. of Instances.	I.	II.	III.	IV.
Verb omitted in *Protasis* after אִם	161	48	108	2	3
" " " " כִּי	6	1	4	1	0
" " " " לֹּ	3	0	0	0	3
" " " " וְ	8	0	7	0	1
Total No. instances,	178	49	119	3	4
In Asseverations and Denials with אִם, אִם־לֹא we have					
Imperfect in *Protasis*,	59	0	59	0	0
Perfect in *Protasis*,	11	0	11	0	0
Verb omitted in *Protasis*,	3	0	3	0	0
יֵשׁ in *Protasis*,	4	0	4	0	0
Total No. instances,	77	0	77	0	0
Infinitive in *Protasis* after אִם	3	1	2	0	0
" " alone,	6	3	3	0	0
Total No. instances,	9	4	5	0	0
Voluntative in *Protasis* after לֹּ	2	0	0	0	2
" " " וְ	2	0	2	0	0
" " alone,	71	0	69	1	1
Total No. instances,	75	0	71	1	3
Modified Perfect in *Protasis*,	38	4	31	3	0
Modified Imperfect in *Protasis*,	4	2	1	1	0
Total No. instances,	42	6	32	4	0

RECAPITULATION.

VERBAL FORMS.				No. of Instances.	I.	II.	III.	IV.
Imperative in *Protasis*,	-	-		531	47	442	28	14
Perfect	"	-	-	245	60	130	15	40
Participle	"	-	-	39	7	26	1	5
Verb omitted	"	-	-	185	49	126	3	7
Infinitive	"	-	-	9	4	5	0	0
Voluntative	"	-	-	75	0	71	1	3
Mod. Perfect	"	-	-	38	4	31	3	0
Mod. Imperfect	"	-	-	4	2	1	1	0
Total No. of instances,	-	-		1,126	173	832	52	69

An examination of the forms used in the *Apodosis* will give us the following Summary:

VERBAL FORMS IN APODOSIS.

VERBAL FORMS.				No. of Instances	I.	II.	III.	IV.
Imperfect in *Apodosis*,	-	-		381	33	277	37	32
Perfect	"	-	-	101	62	17	4	19
Participle	"	-	-	21	3	16	1	1
Apodosis omitted "	-	-		108	2	95	0	9
Verb omitted	"	-	-	93	44	42	4	4
Voluntative	"	-	-	167	0	166	0	1
Mod. Perfect	"	-	-	233	10	218	5	1
Mod. Imperfect	"	-	-	22	19	1	1	2
Total No. of instances,	-	-		1,126	173	832	52	69

Dr. Pick's paper will be found in the December proceedings.

Journal, December, 1882.[*]

The New Testament Witness to the Authorship of Old Testament Books.

BY PROF. FRANCIS BROWN.

A careful examination of this subject seems to be demanded by the conflicting and equally positive statements current in regard to it. *E. g.:*

Turpie, (*The New Testament View of the Old*, London, 1872), who has given the matter the fullest consecutive treatment, assumes, almost without argument, that the language of the New Testament is decisive of questions of authorship, in the case of many important books of the Old Testament. Thus, (p. 124), when speaking of Rom. x. 20, 21,—"Isaiah is very bold and saith"—the citation being from Is. lxv. 1, 2,—he remarks: "Paul thus lets us know the source whence the quotations are drawn. They are taken from Isaiah. Isaiah spake them." On p. 130, he says: "The formula Δαυείδ λέγει, 'David says,' followed by quotations from several Psalms, *viz.*, xvi., xxxii., lxix, and cx., shows us that he was the writer of them." On p. 158, we read: "From our Lord's words, then, 'Have ye not read in the Book of Moses at the bush,' [Ma. xii. 26], I infer that Moses is set forth as the author of the Pentateuch." Similar remarks occur elsewhere in Turpie's book.

Prof. W. H. Green, D. D., says, (*Moses and the Prophets*, p. 345): "The history and legislation of the Pentateuch lies at the basis of all the subsequent history of the Old Testament. It is presupposed in

---

[*] The paper of the Rev. Dr. Craven has not been received.

the Psalms. It is presupposed in the prophets. Moses' authorship has the explicit sanction of our blessed Lord himself."

In our popular religious literature, this argument is dwelt on with great emphasis.

On the other hand, there are other persons, of excellent Christian reputation, who are committed to the opinion that these questions are not settled by New Testament evidence. One of the most emphatic statements to this effect is from the pen of Prof. E. Benj. Andrews, of Brown University, (*Hebrew Student*, Dec., 1882, p. 100): " Let even Wellhausen's view be adopted: there are several ways in which, we are happy to think, every recorded utterance of Christ touching the Pentateuch might be explained in accord with the perfect truthfulness and supernatural character of his teachings."

The existence of opposite views on such an important matter may fairly justify a careful examination of the New Testament writings, with a view to deciding, if possible, which opinion is correct.

The examination proposes no further end than the simple testing of a particular argument. It is not an inquiry into the actual authorship of Old Testament books. Nor does it necessarily involve an answer to such an inquiry. For while it is true that if the New Testament argument is shown to be conclusive, the result will be to establish the authorship of the books in question, it is not true that the opposite decision would involve a denial of particular authorship. It would involve simply a denial that such particular authorship can be proved from the New Testament. For it is agreed on all hands, that the New Testament does not directly, and in terms, deny the particular authorship of any Old Testament book. It is perfectly conceivable, therefore, that the argument might be shown to be unavailable for the purpose for which it is employed, at the same time, that the conclusions sought to be established by the argument were impregnable on other grounds. It is not the more general question as to the *facts* of authorship, but the more limited question as to the bearing of the New Testament argument, which now concerns us.

The inquiry is carefully to be distinguished from certain other more or less kindred questions with which it has been at times unfortunately confounded.

(*a.*) From questions as to the historical character of the Old Testament books, or any parts of them, and as to the New Testament witness to such character. For the purposes of our inquiry it might or might not be that such character is the fact, or that the New Testament proves it. That is a question by itself, and not involved in

the present discussion.   So far as it may be necessary to take any position in the matter, the historical character of such Old Testament writings as claim to be history is here assumed.

(*b.*)   From questions as to the inspiration, authority and canonicity of the Old Testament books, and as to the New Testament witness to these characteristics.   These matters are fully and entirely assumed, at the outset of the discussion, and cannot, therefore, be raised in the progress of it.

(*c.*)   From questions as to the inspiration, authority and canonicity of the New Testament books, and as to the binding force of teachings uttered by our Lord Jesus Christ, or by inspired men, and contained in the New Testament books.   These matters, also, are fully and entirely assumed at the outset, so that whatever, on thorough examination, shall prove to rest on the authority of our Lord, or of the Holy Spirit speaking in and through inspired men, is thereby and at once raised out of the sphere of this discussion.

(*d.*)   From all questions as to the meaning, interpretation, application, etc., of the Old Testament passages which are cited in the New.

We have simply to ask: What kind and degree of evidence is furnished by the New Testament as to the authorship of Old Testament books?   It is plain that one may conceive of the evidence as being either conclusive, or non-conclusive; and if the latter, then as either purely negative evidence, or as presumptive evidence.   If it is presumptive evidence, then the question as to authorship is not settled thereby, but must be finally decided in view of other testimony.   This paper does not occupy itself, however, as has been already said, with other testimony, and it concerns us only to notice that it is perfectly conceivable that testimony from other sources may be such as to confirm any presumptive evidence which the New Testament may furnish, or, on the other hand, such as to destroy the weight of the presumption, and prove the opposite.

It remains only to add, as a last preliminary remark, that in the examination of passages in detail, while the importance of distinguishing between the language of Christ and that of the inspired New Testament men may easily be exaggerated, there is still some advantage in treating them separately.

The question before us is essentially one of exegesis, and we shall be prepared, in a few moments, to inquire as to the meaning of particular passages.   The fact, however, that the number of passages is so small, may be regarded as one among several indications that it was not a prime object of the New Testament speakers and writers,

or of the Holy Spirit, presiding over its composition, to teach the authorship of Old Testament books.*

Assistance has been derived, in making the above table, from Böhl's *Alttestamentliche Citate*, and Turpie's *Old Testament in the New*. The number of citations is difficult to fix with accuracy. It is believed that the table is approximately correct.

On the other hand, it is not to be wondered at, that, living as we do in the midst of a venerable tradition in regard to the authorship of Old Testament books, the citations under the names of particular persons which the New Testament makes from the Old should lead us, antecedently to all detailed examination, to the inference that the writers and speakers who thus cite regarded the persons named as the authors of the books in which the words cited stand. The chief condition to the validity of this inference is the absence of evidence to the contrary. For it must be clear that the natural deduction from New Testament language, in the absence of contrary evidence, does not necessarily determine the question as to the natural deduction *in the face* of such evidence.

These considerations to some extent balance each other, and we leave them for the present behind, in order to inquire into the New Testament facts.

----

* The following table will show how the case stands:

Genesis	is cited 28 times.			Under Moses'	name,	o time.
Exodus	"	"	33	"	"	"	"	2 times.
Leviticus	"	"	12	"	"	"	"	1 time.
Deuteronomy	"	"	41	"	"	"	"	7 times.
1 and 2 Samuel	"	"	3 (?)	"	"	Samuel's	"	1 (?) ti'e.
1 Kings	"	"	2	"	"	Author's	"	o	"
Job	"	"	1 time.	"	"	"	o	"
Psalms	"	"	68 times.	"	David's	"	10 times.
Proverbs	"	"	6	"	"	Author's	"	o time.
Ecclesiastes	"	"	1 time.	"	"	"	o	"
Isaiah	"	"	61 times.	"	Isaiah's	"	17 times.
Jeremiah	"	"	7(?)	"	"	Jeremiah's	"	2	"
Hosea	"	"	6	"	"	Hosea's	"	1 time.
Joel	"	"	2	"	"	Joel's	"	1	"
Amos	"	"	2	"	"	Amos'	"	o	"
Micah	"	"	1 time.	"	Micah's	"	o	"
Habbakuk	"	"	4 times.	"	Habbakuk's	"	o	"
Haggai	"	"	1 time.	"	Haggai's	"	o	"
Zechariah's	"	"	6 times.	"	Zechariah's	"	o	"
Malachi	"	"	5	"	"	Malachi's	"	o	"

The following books of the Old Testament are, by citation or otherwise, connected in the New Testament with the names of particular men: Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy (name of Moses), Samuel (?), Psalms (name of David), Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel. Of these, Jeremiah's name occurs in such a connection but twice; those of Samuel (if at all), Daniel, Hosea and Joel, only once each. It will be convenient to begin with this group, following the order of the names in our English Bibles.

SAMUEL. Acts iii. 24: "All the prophets from Samuel and them that followed after, as many as have spoken they also told of these days." No Messianic prophecy is attributed to Samuel in the Old Testament, and it has accordingly been doubted whether there is reference here to any word or writing connected with his name. It might mean "from the days of Samuel," so that the first of the prophets referred to must have lived at or about the time of Samuel. But the earliest recorded prophecy from near that time is Nathan's, (2 Sam. vii. 12-16), and, when that was uttered, Samuel had been many years dead, (1 Sam. xxv. 1). The reference cannot be to the prophecies of David in the Psalms, for in that case we can hardly doubt that David himself, and not Samuel, would have been named. Further, although it may be said that Samuel was the founder of the *order* of prophets, it does not need an investigation of this matter to convince us that the words as they stand, on their most natural interpretation, include Samuel among those who testified of the Messianic times. The expression is a peculiar one: καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας. If the phrase καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς is to be taken literally, the whole expression means, "the prophets from Samuel and [from] those who followed [him]"; for "Samuel" and "those who followed him" are in the same construction. More than this, they form one group, for the preposition is not repeated. An interpretation must therefore be found which will suit them both. If ἀπὸ denotes simply a prior limit of the time within which οἱ προφῆται prophesied, then οἱ καθεξῆς are not represented as prophesying, any more than Samuel is. But οἱ καθεξῆς must certainly include Nathan and David. Nathan's prophecy (referred to above) is quite explicit, and David is repeatedly cited by Peter himself (who utters Acts iii. 24) as a prophet of the Messiah, so that it is utterly improbable that these should be ignored. But if οἱ καθεξῆς are regarded as prophesying, then there is no exegetical ground for excluding Samuel from the same category. We may compare Luke xxiv. 27: ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ

Μωϋσέωσ καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν,—where the construction of the genitives is the same, and where the preposition is repeated, as it is not in Acts iii. 24; in this case there can be no doubt that the use made of Moses is identical in kind with the use made of all the prophets.

And if we regard the phrase as an inexact one, in which two constructions are mingled: (1.) "All the prophets, from Samuel on, as many as spoke," and (2.) "All the prophets, Samuel and the following, as many as spoke,"—still it is plain that (in 2) Samuel is included under the prophets who spoke, and the fact that such a mingling of the two constructions was possible, shows that Peter, or whoever is responsible for the precise form of the utterance as we have it, did not discriminate between "Samuel" and "the prophets," or between "Samuel" and "those who followed," in their respective functions.

It must be further observed *ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν* does not, on the most natural interpretation, *limit* the *πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται*, (so that, *e. g.*, Samuel might not be included), but rather emphasizes *πάντες*. For *ἐλάλησαν* must be taken in a general sense, to denote the utterance of prophecy, or perhaps, more exactly, of predictive prophecy. The meaning then is: "All the prophets—as many as exercised their prophetic functions in (predictive) utterance—told of these days." If we attempt to limit the meaning of *ἐλάλησαν* to Messianic prediction, then a tautology results; and no one will maintain that *ἐλάλησαν* can be used in mere contrast with prophets who wrote, or prophets who were silent. Those, then, who "told of these days" are the same persons who "spoke," and these are the same with "all the prophets," including "Samuel and those who followed." Doubtless the statement of the verse, thus understood, is hyperbolical, because there were some persons, *e. g.*, Elijah, Elisha, Nahum, and many besides, who were prophets, and who "spoke," but who did not, so far as we are aware, "tell of these days." But this does not warrant us in supposing that the one prophet whose name is expressly mentioned, is to be classed among those who are thus, in the use of hyperbole, ignored.

But if Samuel uttered no Messianic prophecy, and is yet included among those who did utter such prophecies, there is no reasonable explanation of this, except that he is so included because the book which goes by his name contains such a prophecy, and we should understand the reference to Samuel to be at bottom a reference to the words of Nathan, 2 Sam. vii. 12–16,—the one great Messianic proph-

ecy of the book.   Now, just as little as Peter, on this interpretation,
would intend to say that Samuel was the original speaker of the
words which Nathan actually spoke, would he necessarily imply, or
be understood to imply, that Samuel wrote the book which bears his
name.   For the object of using the name of Samuel would be to
identify the prophecy.   And whatever cause, independent of his ac-
tual authorship of it, might lead to the connection of Samuel's name
with this book, that cause, or the resulting habit of so connecting
book and name, would suffice to explain Peter's use of the name to
designate the book.   If, *e. g.*, it were commonly called "Book of
Samuel," or "Samuel," because Samuel was a prominent figure in
it. then Peter would not imply that Samuel wrote it, when he used
this name for it.   As a matter of fact, intelligent Bible-students, who
now use the name do not mean by it "the book which Samuel
wrote," but simply " the book which goes by Samuel's name."   It
is as a mere title that the term is employed, as in the case of " the
Books of Kings " and other anonymous writings of the Old Testa-
ment.   There cannot, therefore, be even a fair presumption in favor
of the view that if Peter here refers, as he probably does, to the
"Book of Samuel," under the name of "Samuel," he thereby im-
plies that Samuel wrote the book to which he refers.

JEREMIAH.   Matt. ii. 17 and xxvii. 9.   The introductory formula
is the same in each case :   *Τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ
προφήτου λέγοντος.*   It is true that there are some variant readings to
Matt. xxvii. 9, but these, it is well known, are of insignificant author-
ity.   (See Westcott and Hort, *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 18.)

We are all familiar with the efforts of commentators to reconcile
this undoubted reading with the equally indubitable fact that in the
prophecies attributed to Jeremiah, in the Old Testament, no such
passage occurs,—the citation is manifestly from Zech. xi. 12, 13.
Such efforts are the attempts to show, *e. g.*, that Zechariah is simply
repeating and enlarging prophecies of Jeremiah (xviii., xix.), (Heng-
stenberg); that Matthew cites from some lost writing of Jeremiah (so
from Origen, various Comm.); or an orally transmitted prophecy
uttered by Jeremiah (Calovius); or that Jeremiah headed the col-
lection of prophets, and the whole collection was therefore called by
his name (Lightfoot and others); or that a mistake in *writing* oc-
curred when the Gospel was first issued (Morrison).   The recognition
of the baseless character of all these attempts leads Turpie to the
thoroughly consistent (if not original) view, "that Jeremiah really

did write that portion of Zechariah's book whence the quotation is made," (*i. e.* chap. ix.–xi.).   Now this involves, not only the dismemberment of the book of Zechariah, but also one of two other things: *either* there was a genuine and trustworthy tradition connecting these prophecies with Jeremiah's name,—a tradition which has strangely vanished from all other testimony which we possess, and appears only in this incidental mention in Matthew,—in which case it is impossible to understand why these prophecies were not from an early time attributed to Jeremiah, and united with his other prophecies; *or* the true authorship was expressly revealed to Matthew, and to him alone, in which case there would be an apparently purposeless and useless breaking through of the general principle already noticed, namely, that questions of authorship were not prominent concerns of revelation;—purposeless and useless, unless it can be shown to be of great consequence to the bearing of the prophecy on the case to which it is applied, that it should have been from Jeremiah and no other.   The hypothesis is thus not to be entertained unless we are prepared to deny the rights of exegetical science and the efficacy of exegetical methods in interpreting the Scriptures.   And yet this appears to be the most nearly tenable view of all those that have been mentioned.   For if the words τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος are of sufficient importance to occasion any difficulty, they must be taken in their real meaning, *i. e.*, "that which was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet, saying " (="who said " or "when he said ").   The views of Hengstenberg and Lightfoot do not satisfy these words; the view of Morrison would destroy all confidence in the New Testament text; and the views of Origen and Calovius are even less likely to be right than that which Turpie maintains, since it is easier to suppose that Jeremiah wrote Zech. ix.–xi. than to suppose that words which occur with such an approximate accuracy in Zech. xi. 12, 13 occurred also, and originally, in some otherwise unknown written or spoken utterance of Jeremiah.   But the only reason for adopting either of these views is the supposed necessity of giving a literal force and binding authority to the words τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος.   Before we decide that this supposed necessity is a sufficient reason for resorting to such frail explanations, it is well to remind ourselves that the case before us does not stand quite alone in the New Testament.   Whether the reference to Isaiah, in Mark i. 2, is at all similar, need not now be decided; that passage will be considered in another connection.   But there is a nearly parallel instance in the Epistle of Jude.   Jude 14, 15, we read:

"And to these also Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying, Behold, the Lord came with ten thousands of his holy ones, [Gr. ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ], to execute judgment upon all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their works of ungodliness which they have ungodly wrought, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."   The introductory formula of quotation is here: Ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνὼχ λέγων, in which, although the divine origin of the prophecy is not brought out as it is in τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου, the human authorship is even more distinctly asserted.   The demand to either accept or explain away the statement as to Jeremiah involves, à fortiori, the same demand as to Enoch.   But in the latter case none of the explanations attempted in the former case can by any means apply.   One of the alternatives would here be still more violent.   We should have to say that either Enoch, seventh from Adam, did actually utter this prophecy which Jude records, or Jude's book is not authoritative, and ought to go out of the canon.   Now the canonicity of Jude is firmly established, so that interpreters have been pressed toward the first alternative.   But in fact we find the passage which Jude cites in the pseudepigraphical Book of Enoch I. 9.   We append three translations of that original passage:

De Sacy.—(Cf. Magasin Encyclopédique, VI., i. 382), cited in Huther's Comm. on Jude, 4th Germ. ed., 1877, Eng. trans., 1881: "Et venit cum myriadibus sanctorum, ut faciat judicium super eos, et perdat impios et litigat cum omnibus carnalibus pro omnibus quae fecerunt et operati sunt contra eum peccatores et impii."

Dillmann.—(Das Buch Henoch, 1853): "Und siehe er kommt mit Myriaden von Heiligen, um Gericht über sie zu halten, und wird die Gottlosen vernichten und rechten mit allem Fleisch über Alles, was die Sünder und die Gottlosen gagen ihn gethan und begangen haben."

Schodde.—(Book of Enoch, 1882): "And behold he comes with myriads of the holy to pass judgment upon them, and will destroy the impious, and will call to account all flesh for everything the sinners and the impious have done and committed against him."

Now, if these words, which are thus referred to a period antedating the Christian era by only a little, are cited by Jude, as they are, under the name of Enoch, and if the alternative forced upon us is, either to consider them an actual utterance of Enoch, the ancient patriarch, or to look upon Jude as an untruthful—and hence uncanonical—book, probably no sober scholar would hesitate to decide

in favor of the latter.   But if we are not willing to accept this alternative, then we must be willing to take the position that the formula of quotation in Jude 14 does not oblige us to consider the patriarch Enoch the actual author of the words there quoted.   But then neither does the formula of quotation in Matt. xxvii. 9 oblige us to consider the prophet Jeremiah the actual author of the words there quoted.*

Some may perhaps claim that while Jude quotes from the Book of Enoch, and gives it a certain authority, he yet writes in the full consciousness of the pseudonymic character of its title, and that his hearers are aware of this also, so that he is not mistaken in the matter, and they are not misled.   To this it might be replied: (1.) Such a thing is indeed not inconceivable, and as one among several possibilities it might be allowed to stand; but as the only ground upon which a defence of Jude could be based, it is insufficient.   There is no evidence in favor of it except the supposed necessity of having it true.   And little as *we* can believe that the Book of Enoch contained prophecies 3,000 years older than itself, just as little can we affirm that men in the first Christian century, even if they knew of the comparatively recent origin of the book, were sure that it did *not* contain such prophecies.   If Jude himself thought this might be the case, then his words express this opinion; if his readers thought so, then his words would confirm them in their belief.   In the absence of testimony on this point, we cannot make the possibility of their greater enlightenment into the corner-stone of our own faith.   (2.) The straightforwardness and the precise shape of the citation-formula are opposed to the view that the book cited was believed to be pseudepigraphical with no genuine contents.   (3.) It is difficult to see on what ground Jude could regard the book as authoritative, and therefore fit to be cited, if he held it to be a pseudepigraph, of which no part was genuine, since it certainly was not regarded as one of the sacred, canonical books.   (4.) That he did so, or even may have done so, ought least of all to be claimed by those who are strenuous

---

* The composition and date of the Book of Enoch present questions too complicated, and requiring too elaborate discussion, for an examination here.   It is sufficient for our purposes to say that the book seems to be a Jewish work, put together from several distinct documents of the second and first centuries B. C., with some Christian interpolations. The absence of any allusion to the menacing armies of Rome indicates that the latest portions cannot be put far down in the first century A. D.

for the conclusiveness of New Testament statements as to the author-
ship of Old Testament books, for the same arguments can be used
upon the other side, under far more favorable conditions, as we
shall presently see.

It would therefore be unsafe to rest any important interest upon
the possibility of such a distinction between the use of the citation-
formulas in Jude 14 and Matt. xxvii. 9, as that just suggested.
Another distinction is of more consequence, but it bears in the
opposite direction.   If, as is altogether probable, Jude supposes him-
self to be citing words of Enoch, we should have to regard him as
holding a wrong opinion.   But if that may be, then much more may
it be that the Evangelist, by a momentary oversight, attributed to
Jeremiah words which, as a little reflection or reading would have
shown him, belonged to Zechariah.

The result of the foregoing considerations should be to convince
us that we need not hesitate to follow Augustine and Calvin, and the
great body of candid, thorough modern commentators (De Wette,
Meyer, Alford, Weiss, Keil, Plumptre, C. H. H. Wright (Comm. on
Zechariah, p. 336), etc., etc.), in holding that there is here a slight
error in the gospel, on a point which in no respect, even the most
distant, affects the important teachings to be conveyed.

Now the introductory formula is just the same in Matt. ii. 17 as in
Matt. xxvii. 9.   It follows therefore: that if there were important evi-
dence from other sources, tending to show that the words cited in the
former passage were not spoken or written by Jeremiah, the presence
of the formula of quotation would not oblige us to hold that they
were.   We find the words, in fact, in Jer. xxxi. 15, and there is no
reason to believe that they are not genuine words of Jeremiah.   If
there were such a reason, however, the presence of the citation for-
mula in Matt. ii. 17 would not destroy its force, for the general
nature of the conclusion already reached as to the non-decisive char-
acter of the formula is as little affected by the presence or absence of
positive evidence from other sources, as it is by the possible necessity
of modifying our view as to the nature of the inaccuracy, in order to
make it apply to both cases.*

DANIEL.   Matt. xxiv. 15.   τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου, fol-
lowed by words which occur in Dan. xi. 31, xii. 11, cf. ix. 27.   A

---

*It is evident that if, in two (or more) instances, a writer wrongly at-
tributed a citation to Jeremiah, his inaccuracy could hardly be attributed
to a momentary oversight.   The parallel would then be Jude's citation
from Enoch.

new element is introduced in this passage, if the words of citation
are really an utterance of Christ himself.*   Now, the assumption that
Jesus might have been here in error would not satisfy those who
argue most strenuously for the authenticity of Old Testament books
on the ground of New Testament statements, nor ought it to satisfy
them.   For while we have indications in more than one place that
Jesus did not know all things at all times (Ma. v. 30–32; xiii. 32, cf.
Matt. xxiv. 36, etc.), still, we do not find him affirming that which
he does not know, and we may confidently say—slightly modifying a
fine remark of Rothe's (*Zur Dogmatik.* 2te Aufl. 1869, p. 175),
"that Jesus never extended the sphere of his desire to know, and
his belief that he knew, beyond the limits of what was actually known
by him."   But the question still remains, whether Jesus does here
commit himself to the authorship of the book of Daniel by a
prophet of that name.   It will be remembered that the passage
cited in Matt. xxiv. 15 is from the second division of the book, a
division which, with the exception of certain brief introductory
notes, contains prophecies exclusively, and that this division is dis-
tinctly marked off from the preceding by the nature of its contents,
and by the brief introduction, Dan. vii. 1.   Now suppose evidence
were to be presented from other quarters to show that while the
book as a whole was not written by Daniel, the last six chapters
contained prophecies of Daniel, which the later author had incorpo-
rated in his book.   On that supposition, the words of Jesus, taken
in their most rigid, literal meaning, would be perfectly satisfied.

We may go yet further.   If other evidence should be adduced,
tending to show that "Daniel, the prophet" was a pseudonym, still,
there would be nothing in Jesus' use of the expression to commit
him to any other view.   For the words were certainly written, and
written in the form of a prophecy, and were a prophecy, and the
book containing them was an inspired, canonical, and authoritative
book; the citation was therefore suitable and forcible, for Jesus' pur-
poses, whoever the author may have been, and the use of a current
pseudonym to designate the author no more committed Jesus to a

---

*It is very possible that these words, which are lacking in the parallel
Ma. xiii. 14, are inserted here by the evangelist.   (See, particularly,
Weiss, *Matthäusevangelium*, 1876, p. 508.)   In that case the formula
would be susceptible of the same treatment as the foregoing, in the
event of the disproof, on the ground of other evidence, of Daniel's
authorship.   But it will be more satisfactory to treat it here as if it were
certainly uttered by Jesus.

declaration that that was the author's real name, than our use of the expression "Junius says" would commit us to a declaration that the "Letters of Junius" were composed by a person of that name; or than, on the supposition already discussed, that "Enoch" was regarded as a pseudonym, Jude 14 would indicate the belief of the author that Enoch himself actually uttered the words which he quotes.*

But it may be replied that the opinion held by the people of Jesus' time must be taken into account. That opinion must have been either contenanced or contradicted by him. Now the prevailing belief of the time was that Daniel was the author of the book which bears his name. Jesus did not contradict this belief; he thereby countenanced and lent his authority to it. In reply, it may be observed: (1.) In the absence of precise knowledge as to the belief of the time in regard to the authorship of the Book of Daniel, it is rash to affirm that those to whom Jesus spoke (it was, be it remembered, his disciples, who "came unto him privately," Matt. xxiv. 3), believed that Daniel was its author. The assertion is not sufficiently established to serve as the foundation for an argument. (2.) But even if it were shown to be true, it is an unwarranted inference that would commit Jesus to this belief. For we cannot venture to condition Jesus' own understanding of the words he employed, by the understanding of limited, prejudiced, ignorant hearers. If, however, we attempt to do so, we must be thoroughgoing. We must blot out John ii. 19, because Jesus speaks of destroying the temple, meaning thereby his body (ver. 21), while the Jews understand it of the temple of Herod. We must blot out Mark v. 39, and John xi. 11, because Jesus speaks of persons as sleeping, when they are really dead, and his words are literally understood, occasioning scornful laughter in one case, and relief in the other. We must expunge most of John viii. We must consent to lose all those parables of Jesus whose

* To assume that "Enoch" is used in Jude 14 as a pseudonym, affords a ground for assuming that "Daniel" may be so used, (if evidence from other quarters is adverse to his real authorship of the book which goes by his name), in Matt. xxiv. 15. But the fact that *Daniel* is a canonical and *Enoch* an uncanonical book, far from making it more difficult to suppose that the former is pseudonymic, makes it easier. For *Daniel* is canonical and authoritative because it is inspired,—whether Daniel wrote it or not,—while *Enoch*, being uncanonical, and lacking strong internal marks of inspiration, must have been considerably dependent for its authority upon the personal weight of its author.

moral lesson was not understood by the hearers. If Jesus, in these deeply significant utterances, exposed himself to utter misapprehension, and was in fact utterly misapprehended, and we take no offense, then there is no reason for seeing in the passage before us any violation of the law of truth, even if the words which Jesus employed to introduce the prophecy were understood by the listeners in a different sense from that in which he understood them. Indeed, there is far less reason in this case than in the others; for the subject of misunderstanding was of unspeakably less consequence,—the inspiration and authority of the citation being secure,—than the profound spiritual teachings referred to above.

We may go farther yet. Let us suppose that the belief of his hearers was to the effect that Daniel wrote the book which bears his name, and that this belief was wrong, and that Jesus knew it was wrong. If he had combatted deeply rooted opinion on this point, it might easily have raised a violent opposition, which would have embarrassed and perhaps thwarted him in his work, and would certainly have diverted thought from the main truths which he was concerned to teach. His work itself obliged him to combat deeply rooted opinions at many points; all the less was he called upon to arouse antagonism in regard to non-essentials. Certain cases of acquiescence in popular belief must indeed be regarded as countenancing that belief. We say, and say rightly, that Jesus could not have acquiesced in the belief about demoniacal possessions, unless that belief were well founded; otherwise his treatment of demoniacs was charlatanry, and his teaching in connection with such treatment was deceptive. But the reference to Daniel does not in the least give peculiar support to the teachings connected with this reference, as long as we admit that a book may be inspired and authoritative, even if its author be unknown; and this we cannot deny without casting a goodly number of Old Testament books out of the canon. Since, therefore, there was no important issue connected with the matter before us, we shall hardly dare to hedge Jesus about with a restriction not set by an imperative moral judgment.

The conclusion is, that if other arguments should make it probable that Daniel was not the real author of the book bearing his name, or of the latter section of it, and even allowing that the words "through Daniel the prophet" are words of Jesus, Jesus is not thereby committed to an opposition to such other arguments.

HOSEA.—Rom. ix. 25, where the introductory words, ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει, are followed by a citation from Hos. ii. 23, i. 10. God is represented as speaking "in Hosea" (not διὰ τοῦ Ὡσηέ), i. e., in all probability, in the book known as "Hosea," just as we have "in David" (Heb. iv. 7), and "Moses is read" (Acts xv. 21, 2 Cor. iii. 15). The name is nothing but the title or designation of the book, by which it is, or may be, commonly known. From this there is no necessary inference as to the writer's position about the authorship of the book. (Cf. what said on this subject under SAMUEL.)

JOEL.—Acts ii. 16: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ, followed by a citation from Joel ii. 28–32, (Heb., LXX., iii. 1–5). The case is here similar to that of "Jeremiah" in Matt. ii. 17. Here, as there, we shall have to say, in view of considerations already advanced, that while, as a matter of fact, there is no reason for doubting that these words were uttered by Joel, yet, if there were, the citation formula of Acts ii. 16 could not decide the matter in the face of such reason.

We pass to consider those New Testament passages which connect citations from the Old Testament with the names of David, Isaiah, and Moses.

DAVID.—The following passages fall into the same category with those which cite Jeremiah and Joel, (see above):*

Acts i. 16. διὰ στόματος Δαυείδ, followed in v. 20 by citations from Ps. lxix. 26, cix. 8.

Acts iv. 25. διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυείδ, followed by a citation from Ps. ii. 1, ff.

Rom. iv. 6. Δαυείδ λέγει, with citation from Ps. xxxii. 1, ff.

Rom. xi. 9. Δαυείδ λέγει, with citation from Ps. lxix. 23.

The following resembles the citation from Hosea, given above: Heb. iv. 7: ἐν Δαυείδ λέγων, with citation from Ps. xcv. 8.

Somewhat different is Acts ii. 25: Δαυείδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν, with citation from Ps. xvi. 8–11; here, v. 29 seems to make the person of David important, and to throw emphasis upon his authorship of the words cited. So also:

Acts ii. 34: λέγει δὲ αὐτός, with citation from Ps. cx. 1, where the preceding words, οὐ γὰρ Δαυείδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, make David's person important to the argument.

---

* See, also, foot-note to p. 106.

Peter seems to be thus committed to the Davidic authorship of the Psalms which he here quotes,—Ps. xvi, and cx.

There is some likeness between the cases just noted and the single citation which Jesus connects with David's name.   It is from Ps. cx. 1, and is recorded by all the Synoptists:

Matt. xxii. 43.   πῶς οὖν Δ. ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, λέγων, etc.

Ver. 45.   εἰ οὖν Δ. καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, etc.

Mark xii. 36.   αὐτὸς Δ. εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ, etc.

Ver. 37.   αὐτὸς Δ. λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον, etc.

Luke xx. 42.   αὐτὸς γὰρ Δ. λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν, etc.

Ver. 44.   Δ. οὖν αὐτὸν κύριον καλεῖ, etc.

In these passages the argument turns upon the assumption that David, and none other, uttered the words cited, so that, by a literal and rigid interpretation we should reach the conclusion that Jesus countenanced the Davidic authorship of Ps. cx.   The question, however, has been raised more than once, and is a fair one, whether Jesus may not here have been employing the belief of his opponents for the purpose of convicting them of an imperfect understanding of their own sacred books, or an imperfect conception of the Messiah. If so, then there is here no commitment of Jesus to the Davidic authorship of Ps. cx.; and while the same argument cannot be used in regard to Acts ii. 34, the number of passages which authoritatively connect David's name with Ps. cx. would be reduced from four to one.

ISAIAH.   The following passages fall into the same category with those which cite Jeremiah and Joel:*

Matt. iii. 3.   διὰ 'Ησαίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος, with citation from Is. xl. 3.

Matt. iv. 14.   id., with citation from Is. ix. 1 ff.

Matt. viii. 17.   id., with citation from Is. liii. 4.

Matt. xii. 17.   id., with citation from Is. xlii. 1–4.

Luke iii. 4.   ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων 'Ησαίου τοῦ προφήτου, with citation from Is. xl. 3–5.

Luke iv. 17.   βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου 'Ησαίου. with citation from Is. lxi. 1 ff.   This and the preceding seem to belong here rather than in the category of "Hosea" (see above).

John i. 23.   καθὼς εἶπεν 'Ησαίας ὁ προφήτης, with citation from Is. xliii. 3.

*See also foot note to page 106.

John xii. 38.   *ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἠσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν*, with citation from Is. liii. 1.

John xii. 39, 41.   *εἶπεν Ἠσαίας*, with citation from Is. vi. 9 ff.

Acts viii. 28, 30.   *ἀνεγίνωσκεν τὸν προφήτην Ἠσαίαν*, with citation from Is. liii. 7.   This probably belongs here, rather than with "Hosea" (see above).

Acts xxviii. 25.   *διὰ Ἠσαίου τοῦ προφήτου*, with citation from Is. vi. 9 ff.

Rom. ix. 27.   *Ἠσαίας δὲ κράζει*, with citation from Is. x. 22 ff.

Rom. ix. 29.   *προείρηκεν Ἠσαίας*, with citation from Is. i. 9.

Rom. x. 16.   *Ἠσαίας γὰρ λέγει*, with citation from Is. liii. 1.

Rom. x. 20.   *Ἠσαίας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει*. with citation from Is. lxv. 1 ff.

Rom. xv. 12.   *Ἠσαίας λέγει*, with citation from Is. xi. 10.

The following are utterances of Jesus, and belong to the same category with the passage which cites Daniel (see above):

Matt. xiii. 14.*   *ἡ προφητεία Ἠσαίου ἡ λέγουσα*, with citation from Is. vi. 9 ff.

Matt. xv. 7.   *ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἠσαίας λέγων*, with citation from Is. xxix. 13.

Mark vii. 6.   *ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἠσαίας . . . ὡς γέγραπται ὅτι*, followed by a citation from Is. xxix. 13.

Thus far, there is nothing which determines the question for us, whether Isaiah was the author of the book which bears his name, or of this or that portion of it.

But a passage yet to be examined, not only fails to reverse this decision, but strengthens the argument upon which it is in large part based.

This passage is Mark i. 2: *γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἠσαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ*, followed *first*, by a citation from Mal. iii. 1, and then by a citation from Is. xl. 3.   If the citation from Malachi were not present, the clause would offer no difficulty, but might be classed, either with "Jeremiah" and "Joel" or with "Hosea."   But as the text stands, —and there is no sufficient reason for questioning it, †—the author apparently cites words of Malachi as words of Isaiah.   There are

---

*It is quite likely, however, that the parallel, Mark iv. 12, where no prophet is named, reports Jesus' words more accurately. (See, especially, Weiss, *Marcusevangelium*, p. 145, and *Matthäusevangelium*, p. 341).   In that case *Ἠσαίου* belongs here to the Evangelist, and the passage falls into the category of Jeremiah and Joel.

† ℵ BDL Vulg. Orig. and all critical edd.

three classes of attempts to explain this difficulty away. One seeks to do so by dwelling on the appropriateness of including the whole range of prophecy, "from Isaiah to Malachi," in the prediction about Christ's Forerunner. But surely that is a design which would need to be expressed with some clearness, if it were to accomplish its result. Another tries to account for the insertion of the citation from Malachi on the ground that it prepared the way for the right understanding of the passage from Isaiah. But Isaiah's prophecy is more concrete and intelligible in its application to John, than the other. Neither does a commentary generally precede the text it is designed to explain. This cannot be the relation of the two cited passages. Another tries a mechanical explanation; Turpie (p. 52) gives a crude form of this: "ἐν τῷ 'Ησίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ would thus be *the name of the book* from which Mark quotes, which might contain more writings than Isaiah's only. Now, may we not suppose, then, that Isaiah's name was given to a division of the sacred writings, because his name was placed first in it, or for some other reason, and that Mark consequently described the division by its usual well-known name?" We might refute Turpie by Turpie, for he says elsewhere (p. 158), that "the four last books of the Pentateuch were named 'the book of Moses,' not because they tell the story of his life [or 'for some other reason?'] but because he wrote them." But we may be permitted, further, to wonder what has become of all the (doubtless) abundant testimony which must, on Turpie's theory, have once been extant, to the effect that of "a division of the sacred writings" which contained Isaiah and Malachi, Isaiah was the "usual and well-known name?" So every supposition as to a possible explanation from the heading of the MSS. of the Minor Prophets is devoid of proof. The substitution of ישעיה for הושע, or 'ΗΣΑΙΑΣ for ΩΣΗΕ needs some evidence if it is to be accepted.

Neither is it possible to ignore the difficulty altogether. If Mark had been, as he wrote, conscious of the fact that Isaiah was not the author of the first citation, he could not have expressed himself as if Isaiah were the author. No Englishman or American with a clear remembrance of what were Shakespeare's words and what Milton's, could write:

"As Milton says:

"'Mark you this, Bassanio,——
    The devil can quote Scripture for his purpose.'"
"'But all was false and hollow, though his tongue
    Dropped manna; and could make the worse appear

> The better reason, to perplex and dash
> Maturest counsels.' "—(Parad. Lost, ii. 112, ff.)

We conclude that the citation-formula is here not an authoritative guide to the real authorship of the words which immediately follow, and it is thus all the more evident that the argument in the case of "Jeremiah" was correct, and that there is no conclusive evidence from the New Testament as to the authorship of the book which bears Isaiah's name.*

We have now, in the last place, to turn our attention to the Pentateuch. The name of MOSES occurs some eighty times in the New Testament, but the number of passages to be considered does not exactly coincide with this, since the name of Moses is sometimes repeated in the same immediate connection. We have fifty-eight New Testament passages to examine, and these may be classified as follows, using the words of the Revised Version for convenience sake, on account of the length of some of the citations:

(1.)—WORDS OF JESUS.

(a.) Referring to acts of Moses:
1. John iii. 14. As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness.
2. John vi. 32. It was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven.

(b.) Referring to Moses as lawgiver, in general:
1. Matt. xxiii. 2. The scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat.

---

* The question as to how the mistake occurred need not here be elaborately discussed. Meyer attributes it to an error of memory on Mark's part, resulting from the similarity in contents of the two passages, their frequent employment in the same connection, and the more prominent place and richer contents of Isaiah's prophecies. If Mark wrote on the basis of earlier documents, then we might suppose that Matthew, who gives the two citations in different places (Is. xl. 3, attributed to Isaiah, Matt. iii. 3, and Mal. iii. 1, attributed to no one, Matt. xi. 10), shows us their original connection, and that Mark, who does not elsewhere cite Old Testament prophecies, has combined them. It would then be intelligible, that in writing, where there is always the possibility of a more or less mechanical error, when the words of older documents are combined, both citations should be attributed to the famous prophet, to whom the second was attributed by Matthew, and presumably in the document which Mark had before him.

2. John vii. 19.   Did not Moses give you the law ?
    Or as giver of particular laws:
3. Matt. viii. 4.   Offer the gift that Moses commanded.
    (Law for purification of leper, Lev. xiv.)
4. Mark i. 44.   *Id.*
5. Luke v. 14.   *Id.*
6. Matt. xix. 8.   Moses . . . suffered you to put away
    your wives.   (Ref. to Deut. xxiv., 1ff.)
7. Mark vii. 10.   Moses said, Honor thy father and thy
    mother.   (Ref. to Ex. xx. 12, or Deut. v. 16.)
8. John vii. 22, 23.   For this cause hath Moses given you
    circumcision (not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers).
    . . .   If a man receives circumcision on the Sabbath,
    that the law of Moses may not be broken.   (Ref. to
    Levit. xii. 3.)

(*c.*) Speaking of the Book of Moses, Law of Moses, or "Moses"
(=Book of Moses):

1. Mark xii. 26.   Have ye not read in the book of Moses,
    in *the place concerning* the Bush ?   (Ref. to Ex. iii. 6.)
2. Luke xvi. 29, 31.   Moses and the prophets.
3. Luke xxiv. 44.   All things . . . which are written in
    the law of Moses.

(*d.*) Citing words on the (oral or written) authority of Moses:

1. Mark x. 3, 5.   What did Moses command you ? . . .
    For your hardness of heart he wrote you this command-
    ment.   (Parallel with Matt. xix. 8.)
2. Luke xx. 37.   Moses shewed, in *the place concerning* the
    Bush, when he calleth the Lord God the God of Abra-
    ham.   (Parallel with Mark xii. 26.)
3. John v. 45–47.   There is one that accuseth you, *even*
    Moses, on whom ye have set your hope.   For if ye be-
    lieved Moses ye would believe me; for he wrote of me.
    But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe
    my words ?

Here are sixteen passages.   The two under (*a.*) have no bearing
on our question.   Neither have the eight under (*b.*).   For to say
that Moses gave the law, or certain laws, is not to say that he him-
self wrote down the law, or these laws, still less that he wrote the
Pentateuch, which contains the laws and much besides.   The three
passages under (*c.*) are inconclusive for the same reason that "Hosea"

(Rom. ix. 25) is inconclusive as to the authorship of the Old Testament book which goes by the name of that prophet.   (See above, under Hosea.)   Under (d.), Mark x. 3, 5 is satisfied by the supposition that Moses wrote what Deut. xxxi. 9 (cf. v. 24) says he wrote; but this is not even equivalent to the whole book of Deuteronomy, still less to the whole Pentateuch.   Luke xx. 37 need not express anything more than that Moses was authority for the account of the scene at the Bush, without involving his authorship of the book or document containing the account, still less of the Pentateuch as a whole.*   In John v. 45–47, we find mention of Moses as having written, and of writings of Moses, familiar, as such, to the Jews.   These writings are considered under the aspect of prophecy concerning Christ.   Now whether we regard the expressions, "he wrote of me," and "his writings," as referring to a single prophecy contained in the writings, or to several single prophecies, or to the whole prophetic tenor or the writings, the passage does not teach the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.   If it were highly probable, on other grounds, that Moses wrote Genesis, and nothing more, we could not from this passage prove that he wrote anything more, except by denying the Messianic character of Gen. iii. 15, or xii. 3.   If it were highly probable, on other grounds, that Moses wrote Deuteronomy and nothing more, we could not from this passage prove that he wrote anything more, except by denying the Messianic character of Deut. xviii. 15–19.   If it were highly probable, on other grounds, that Moses wrote only some part of the middle books of the Pentateuch, our passage would not stand in the way, unless the part so attributed to him should contain nothing which could be regarded as prophecy, whether direct or typical, of the Messiah.

The language of Jesus is therefore inconclusive.

(2).—WORDS OF INSPIRED MEN.

(a.) Referring to acts of Moses, or Moses as a historical character:
    1. Matt. xvii. 3, 4.   Transfiguration.
    2. Mark ix. 4, 5.   *Id.*
    3. Luke ix. 30, 33.   *Id.*
    4. Rom. v. 14.   †Death reigned from Adam until Moses.

---

* Neither ought the probability to be overlooked, that Mark has given the more accurate form of Jesus' words.   (See Weiss, *Marcusevangelium*, p. 399.)

† This passage might possibly fall under (b.).

    5. Rom. ix. 15.   For he saith to Moses.   (Ref. to Ex. xxxiii. 19.)

    6. 1 Cor. x. 2.   Baptized unto Moses.

    7. 2 Cor. iii. 7, 13.   Could not look steadfastly upon the face of Moses. . . . And are not as Moses, *who* put a veil upon his face.   (Ref. to Ex. xxxiv. 29, ff.)

    8. 2 Tim. iii. 8.   As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses.

    9. Heb. iii. 2–5.   Faithful . . . as also was Moses . . . Worthy of more glory than Moses. . . . And Moses indeed was faithful.

   10. Heb. iii. 16.   They that came out of Egypt by Moses.

   11. Heb. viii. 5.   Moses is warned of God.   (Ref. to Ex. xxv. 40, and xxvi. 30.)

   12. Heb. xi. 23–28.   By faith Moses, when he was born, etc.   (Ref. to Ex. ii. 2, 11 ff.; xii. 21, etc.)

   13. Heb. xii. 21.   Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake.

   14. Jude 9.   Disputed about the body of Moses.

Some of these passages are difficult to explain, historicallly, (*e. g.*, 2 Tim. iii. 8; Heb. xii. 21; Jude 9), but it is not at all difficult to see that they have no bearing on the authorship of the Pentateuch.

  (*b.*) Referring to Moses as lawgiver:

    1. Luke ii. 22.   Purification according to the law of Moses.   (Ref. to Levit. xii. 2.)

    2. John i. 17.   The law was given by Moses.

    3. Acts xiii. 39.   Could not be justified by the law of Moses.

    4. Acts xxi. 21.*   Thou teachest all the Jews . . . to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.

    5. Heb. vii. 14.   Judah, as to which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests.

    6. Heb. x. 28.   A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth.   (Ref. to Deut. xvii. 2–7.)

    7. Heb. ix. 19, 20.†   When every commandment had been spoken by Moses unto all the people according to the law, he took the blood of the calves and the goats, . . . saying, This is the blood of the covenant, etc.

  (*c.*) Referring to the Law of Moses, and "Moses" (=Book of Moses):

    1. Luke xxiv. 27.   Beginning from Moses and all the prophets.

    2. Acts xv. 21.   Moses . . . hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues.

---

* We do not raise the question whether this utterance should be regarded as inspired.

† Ver. 19^b might be classed under (*a.*), and ver. 20.

3. Acts xxviii. 23. Persuading them concerning Jesus, both from the law of Moses, etc.

4. 1 Cor. ix. 9. It is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox, etc. (Ref. to Deut. xxv. 4.)

5. 2 Cor. iii. 15. Whensoever Moses is read.

The seven passages under (*b.*), and the five under (*c.*) are thus all inconclusive. (See above.)

(*d.*) Citing words on the (oral or written) authority of Moses:

1. Acts iii. 22, 23. Moses indeed said. (Ref. to Deut. xviii. 15, ff.)

2. Acts vii. 37. This is that Moses which said. (*Id.*)

3. Acts xxvi. 22. What the prophets and Moses did say should come.

4. Rom. x. 5. Moses writeth that the man that doeth the righteousness. (Ref. to Levit. xviii. 5.)

5. Rom. x. 19. Moses saith. (Ref. to Deut. xxxii. 21.)

1, 2 and 5 under (*d.*) affirm that Moses said what Deuteronomy says he said; 3 belongs with John v. 45–47, (see above); 4 may be classed with the citations from Jeremiah and Joel, already discussed, or *may* refer to some document or portion of the Pentateuch.

(*e.*) Coming under none of the previous heads is Rev. xv. 3. They sing the song of Moses,—*i. e.*, a *new* song, of which Moses is author, or joint-author.

The thirty-two passages thus considered are all inconclusive.

But it may be said that the current belief of the time was that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Jesus and his apostles used words *susceptible* of that interpretation, and must have been understood as countenancing that view. But this they could not have permitted, if the view was wrong.

The reply, as in the case of Daniel (see above), is twofold:

First. It is by no means absolutely certain that the current belief of the time, in Palestine, made Moses the author of the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch itself certainly makes no direct assertion of this,* neither is there anything, from Joshua to Malachi, which tends to show that Moses wrote anything more than the Pentateuch says he wrote.† The case is the same with the Apocryphal Books of the Old

---

* The passages in which it is said or clearly implied that Moses wrote something are these Ex. xvii. 14, xxiv. 4, xxxiv. 27, 28; Num. xxxiii. 2; Deut. xxxi. 9, 19, 22, 24.

† There are references in plenty to Moses as lawgiver, to the " Law of Moses," " Book of the Law of Moses," and " Book of Moses," but we have already seen how entirely inconclusive these expressions are as to the authorship of the Pentateuch.

Testament.   Down to the very time of Christ there is no evidence
that the Jews believed Moses to have written the Pentateuch as a
whole.   The view comes first to light with Philo and Josephus, in
the first Christian century.*   But Philo does not stand in the line of
Palestinian tradition, and it may be doubted whether Josephus does.
At all events, it is difficult to understand how, if the Palestinian
Jews believed that Moses gave the Pentateuch the literary form which
it had in their time, the Palestinian author of IV. Ezra (xiv. 9 ff.)
could—also in the first century—represent Ezra as putting the Pen-
tateuch, by his restoration of it, into the literary form in which the
author and his contemporaries knew it,—without a single mention of
Moses, or allusion to him as the original author.   The often-cited
passage of the Bababathrâ; 14ᵇ, where Moses is said to have written
"his book" (=Pentateuch), except the last eight verses,—differing
in this important exception from Philo and Josephus—is too late to
determine the question as to the belief of Christ's time.†

In the New Testament itself there are twelve passages in which the
name of Moses is employed by uninspired persons:

(*a.*) Moses as lawgiver:
   1. Matt. xix. 5.   Why did Moses command to give a bill of
      divorcement?   (Ref. to Deut. xxiv. 1.)
   1. Matt. xxii. 24.   Moses said, If a man die, etc.   (Ref. to Deut.
      xxv. 5.)
   3. Mark x. 4.=Matt. xix. 5.
   4. John [viii. 5].   In the law, Moses commanded us to stone
      such.   (Ref, to Levit. xx. 10.)
   5. Acts vi. 1.   Change the customs which Moses delivered
      unto us.
   6. Acts xv. 1.   Be circumcised after the custom of Moses. (Ref.
      to Levit. xii. 3, etc.)
   7. Acts xv. 5.   Keep the law of Moses.

(*b.*) Moses as object of personal veneration:
   1. John ix. 28, 29.   We are disciples of Moses . . .   we know
      that God hath spoken unto Moses.
   2. Acts vi. 11.   Blasphemous words against Moses.

(*c.*) Moses as a writer:

---

*E. g., Philo, *Vita Mos.* ii. 8, iii. 39, etc.   Josephus *Pref. Antiq.;*
Antiq. i. 1, 1; iv. 8, 48; xvii. 6, 3; *Cont. Ap.* i. 8, etc.

†For a fuller discussion of these points, see an article, "The New
Testament and the Pentateuch, IV.", in the *Independent*, Mar. 29, 1883,
where also some other kindred matters are treated.

    1. Mark xii. 19.   Moses wrote unto us (Ref. to Deut. xxv. 5, and for the writing, cf. Deut. xxxi. 9, 24.)

    2. Luke xx. 28.   *Id.*

    3. John i. 45.   Him, of whom Moses in the law . . . did write.   (Similar to John v. 45–47, *q. v.*)

Not only do not these twelve passages prove the popular belief in Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch as a whole, but the omission of Moses' name in every one of the twenty-three instances where Genesis is cited in the New Testament,—particularly with the citation of Gen. ii. 24, in Matt. xix. 4 ff., (notice, on the other hand, the emphatic position of "Moses" in ver. 7,—τί οὖν Μωυσῆς ἐνετείλατο), and Mark x. 6,—suggests the inquiry whether he can be thought to have written that book.*

It may be freely admitted that the foregoing considerations do not *disprove* the existence in Palestine, at Christ's time, of a belief in Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch;† they do, however, show that this belief is not so fully and clearly demonstrated as is commonly assumed, and that there are some difficulties in the way of supposing it to have existed, and in favor of different traditions on the subject.

But, *secondly*, even if it did exist, and the people to whom Christ and his inspired followers spoke understood their language in that sense, the question is not thereby determined.   It must be remembered that the opinion of Philo and Josephus—which alone can be supposed to represent the opinion of contemporary Palestine,—included the Mosaic authorship of Deut. xxxiv. 5–12.   If Jesus and the inspired men, then, by their language, authorized any such view, it must have been precisely this view.   Those, therefore, who are not willing to attribute these eight verses to Moses, cannot claim that the authorship of the Pentateuch is settled by the popular belief of Christ's time.   But it must be remembered, also, that we have no right to demand of revealed truth, whether delivered by Jesus or through his followers, that it shall set right all the false opinions of the men to whom it comes, when these do not affect the substance or the sanctions of the revelation.   It is never, in a single instance, of consequence to the purposes of their teaching, that when Jesus and his

---

   * See *Independent*, Mar. 29, 1883.

   † If Rom. x. 5 falls into the category of the passages which cite Jeremiah (cf. Enoch) and Joel, then it would tend to prove that Paul had this belief.   Luke xx. 37 would *perhaps* come under the same head, if it is the Evangelist who, by the form of his sentence, connects Moses so closely with Ex. iii. 6.

followers speak of Moses, they should be understood as saying or implying that he wrote the Pentateuch. They make great use of his authority as lawgiver and prophet, but that is unimpaired, if the Pentateuch *contains* his laws and prophecy,—whether he, or somebody centuries later, put the Pentateuch into its present form.   In other cases we never think of criticizing men who quote, as an author's words, what he really did say, and what those whom they address believe him to have said, merely because the audience holds the mistaken belief that he said certain other things which have no necessary bearing on the matter in hand.   There is no reason why we should apply any other standard to Jesus and his followers.   If they could let the wrong physics and astronomy of their time pass unquestioned, then there was no obligation on them to correct the popular belief about the authorship of the Pentateuch, if that, too, was incorrect. (See further under DANIEL.)

The case in regard to Moses, and the authorship of the Pentateuch, is, then, as follows:

(1.) Words of Jesus,	16 passages, inconclusive.
(2.) Words of inspired men,	32 passages, inconclusive.
(3.) Words of uninspired men,	12 passages, inconclusive.
	60 passages, inconclusive.
Counted twice,	2
Total,	58

From these passages we may deduce:

That Moses was a great lawgiver;

That, in particular, he ordained the Sabbath-law, uttered the fifth commandment, prescribed circumcision, a purification-offering for a cleansed leper, and the brother's marriage of his deceased brother's wife; that he allowed divorce, under certain conditions; and that he wrote of Christ.   Further than this, the New Testament does not allow us to go.   His laws and his writings may have been preserved in separate documents, written by different hands.   They may have been edited, combined with other documents of various authorship and date, and our Pentateuch have been so constituted, generations or centuries after Moses' time.   When, or by whom, the Pentateuch was put into the form in which we have it, is not determined by the words of Christ.

The following summary will conclude this paper:

The Old Testament Books number	39
Not cited in the New Testament,	13
Cited in the New Testament,	26
Cited with no mention of a person's name,	16
Cited in connection with a person's name,	10

These ten are Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Samuel (?), Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel. In connection with the persons mentioned with the citations from these books, we have examined all the passages which concerned our subject:

Samuel,	1
Daniel,	1
Hosea,	1
Joel,	1
Jeremiah,	2
David,	10
Isaiah,	20
Moses,	58

Except in the case of Ps. xvi. and cx., which the argument of the context where they are cited necessarily assigns to David, and except in the case of certain parts of the Pentateuch, which the Pentateuch and the New Testament alike assign to Moses, the questions of authorship which arise in studying the Old Testament receive no conclusive answer from the New.

Lost Hebrew Manuscripts.

BY REV. B. PICK, PH. D.

That Hebrew manuscripts existed at a very early time, may be seen from the following passage in the Mishna *Sopherim*, vi. 4.: "R. Simon ben Lakish says, three codices (of the Pentateuch) were found in the court of the temple, one of which had the reading מָעֹון, the other וַיַעטוּטֵי, and the third differed in the number of passages wherein הִיא is read with a *Jod*. Thus in the one codex it was written מְעֹין, *dwelling* (Deut. xxxiii. 27), whilst the other two codices had מְעֹינֶה ; the reading of the two was therefore declared valid, whereas that of the one was invalid. In the second codex, again, וַיַעטוּטֵי was found (Exod. xxiv. 11), whilst the other two codices had אֶת־נַעֲרֵי ; the reading in which the two codices agreed was declared valid, and that of the one invalid. In the third codex, again, there were only nine passages which had הִיא written with a *Jod* (as it is generally written הִיא with a Vau), whereas the other two had eleven passages; the readings of the two were declared valid, and those of the one invalid." The minute prescriptions contained in the Talmud concerning the material, color, letters, writing instruments, etc., for the manuscripts, only prove the fact that such manuscripts existed, otherwise St. Jerome could not have written "veterum librorum fides de Hebraicis voluminibus examinanda est." (*Epist. ad Luinium*). The greatest care was exhibited in writing of MSS., and three mistakes were sufficient to make a copy naught. (Tr. *Menathoth*, fol. 29, col. 2.)

When the study of the Talmud was no longer attractive amid the disorder and frequent closing of the Babylonian academies, and ulterior development of the traditions became exhausted, attention was

more directed to Scripture. The number of MSS. increased, especially as to them the various systems of vowels and accents of the Massorah, together with the first elements of grammar, were appended. But not all of these MSS. are now extant; some are only known from the quotations made from them by different writers.

The most famous of these lost MSS. is

The Codex Hillelis.

As to the name of this codex, there is a difference of opinion. From Jewish history we know that there were two by the name of Hillel; one who lived in the first century before Christ, called Hillel I., the Great, the other who lived in the fourth century after Christ, called Hillel II. Some, as Schikhard (*Jus Regium Hebraeorum*, ed. Carpzov, Lipsiae 1674, p. 39), Cuneus (*De Republ. Hebr.*, p. 159), attributed this codex to the older Hillel; others, as D. Gans in his *Tzemah David*, Buxtorf (*Tractatus de punctorum vocalium*, etc., Basil. 1648, p. 353), attributed it to the younger Hillel. A third opinion is that this codex derives its name from the fact that it was written at Hilla, a town built near the ruins of ancient Babel: so Fürst (*Geschichte des Karäerthums*, p. 22 sq. 138, note 14), and Ginsburg (*Levitas Massoreth ha-Massoreth*, p. 260, note 40).

But neither of these opinions seems to be correct. Against the the first two we have the express testimony of *Abraham ben Samuel Sakkuto*[1], who, in his *Book of Genealogies*, entitled "Sepher Yuchasin," says that when he saw the remainder of the codex (circa A. D. 1500) it was 900 years old. His words are these: "In the year 4956, on the 28th day of Ab (*i. e.* in 1196, better 1197), there was a great persecution of the Jews in the kingdom of Leon from the two kingdoms which came to besiege it. It was then that the twenty-four sacred books, which were written long ago, about the year 600, by Rabbi Moses ben Hillel, in an exceedingly correct manner, and after which all copies were corrected, were taken away. I saw the remaining two portions of the same, viz., the earlier Prophets (*i. e.* Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings), and the later Prophets (*i. e.* Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor Prophets)—written in large and beautiful characters, which were brought to Portugal and sold in Africa, where they still are, having been written 900 years ago. Kimchi, in his Grammar on Numb. xv. 4, says that the Pentateuch of this codex was extant in Toleti." (*Yuchasin*, ed. Filipowski, London 1857, p. 220[b]). From this statement it may be deduced

---

1 Comp. my art. in McClintock & Strong's *Cyclop.* s. v.

that this codex was written about the seventh century. As to the third opinion, deriving the name from Hilla, a town near Babel, we may dismiss it as very ingenious. A better opinion seems to be that of **Strack** (*Prolegomena*, p. 16), who says: " fortasse tamen recte cogitabis eum e numero τῶν סוֹפְרִים in Hispania fuisse." This is also the opinion of the famous critic Jedidja Norzi (x 1630), who remarks on Genes. i. 5: " He was a very good Masoretic scholar and a scribe in the city of Toletola" (הוא היה הכם בעוז המסורת וסכרו היה בעיר טוליטולא)

Whatever uncertainty may be about the derivation of its name, certain it is that this codex is very important for the criticism of the Old Testament Hebrew text, as the many quotations which we find in Norzi's critical commentary, entitled מנחת שי (*minhath shai*), published Mantua 1742–44, Vienna 1813, Warsaw 1860–66, and in Lonzano's critical work, entitled אוֹר תּוֹרה (*or torah*).

In the twelfth century this codex was perused by the Jewish grammarian, *Jacob ben Eleazar*, as David Kimchie testifies in his grammatical work *Michlul* (ed. Fürth 1793, fol. 78 col. 2, where we read: וכתב ר׳ . . יעקב בן אלעזר כי־בספר הללי אשר בטוליטולא מצא וכל־מבחר נְדריכם אֲשֶׁר תִּדְרוּ־לה הדלת רפה *i. e.*, and rabbi Jacob ben Eleazar writes that in the codex Hillel, which is at Toletola, he found that the *daleth* in תדריו was raphe (Deut. xii. 11), and fol. 127 col. 2 in fine, he writes: " R. Jacob ben Eleazar writes, that in the codex Hillel, which is at Toletola, the word הָאָפֶה הָמֵץ (בצירי) is written with a *tzere* לֹא הָאָפֶה חָמֵץ Lev. vi. 10).

We now subjoin from Lonzano, Norzi and other critics, some readings of the codex Hillel:—

Gen. iv. 8.—In some editions of the Old Testament there is a space left between אָחִיו and וַיְהִי, and is marked in the margin by פִּסְקָא, *i. e.*, space. The LXX. Sam., Syr., Vulg. and Jerus. Targ. add, " let us go into the field." The space we have referred to is found in the editions of Buxtorf, Menasseh ben Israel, Walton, Nissel, Hutter, Clodius, Van der Hooght. But, says Lonzano, the *piska* is a mistake of the printer, for in the MSS. which he consulted and in codex Hillel is no space. The addition, " let us go into the field," is not found by Symmachus, Theodotion and Onkelos. Even *Origen* remarks, διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέδιον ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ οὐ γέγραπται (Tom. II. 30).

Gen. ix. 29.—A great many codd. and edd. read וַיְהִיוּ, but codex Hillel וַיְהִי

Gen. xix. 16.—וַיִּתְמַהְמֵהּ, here Lonzano remarks that the second *mem* is written with *kamez* in codd. and in cod. Hillel. In the edition of Baer and Delitzsch the word is thus written וַיִּתְמַהְמָהּ

Gen. xix. 20.—אִמָּלְטָה נָּא, Lonzano says that נא is *raphe*, but in Hillel it is with a *dagesh*. In Baer and Delitzsch's Genesis it is written raphe.

Gen. xxvii. 25.—לוֹ וַיָּבֵא, in the cod. Hillel, says Lonzano, the accent *darga* is in the yod.   In our editions it is in, or rather under, the *beth*. Baer and Delitzsch follow the cod. Hillel.

Gen. xxxix. 6.—מַרְאֶה, Norzi remarks that the Hillel codex writes מראה with *tzere*.

Gen. xlii. 16.—הֵאָסְרוּ, in the margin of an old codex, belonging now to Dr. S. Baer, the editor of the new edition of the Old Testament, in connection with Prof. Delitzsh, it is written בהלל הֵאָסְרוּ *i. e.*, in the cod. Hillel the reading is with *segol*.

Gen. xlvi. 13.—וּפֻוָה, on this word Lonzano remarks that in Hillel and other codd. the *vau* is raphe, *i. e.*, וּפָוָה

Exod. x. 9.—וּבִזְקֵנֵנוּ, in Hillel, remarks Lonzano, it is written מלא *i. e.*, plene, ובזקנינו יוד

Exod. xxxvii. 8.—בְּרוּב, in Hillel and in some other codd., remarks Lonzano, it is written with a *makkeph*.

Josh. xxi. 35, 36.—Cod. Kennic. No. 357, reads in the margin לא מצינו בהלל פסוקים השני אלו, *i. e.*, these two verses are not found in the codex Hillel.   Similar is the remark in a manuscript formerly belonging to H. Lotze, of Leipzig.

Prov. viii. 16.   A great many codd. editions and ancient versions, as Syriac, Vulgate, Targum, and even the Graecus Venetus, read here שפטי צֶדֶק, whilst the Complutensian and other codd. read ש' אֶרֶץ, which is also supported by Hillel codex, and is adopted in Baer's ed. of Proverbs.

The Codex Sanbuki.[2]

Nothing is known of the author, place and time when this codex was written.   According to Richard Simon (*Biblioth Critic*. I., 367) the name Sanbuki (זנבוקי) is derived from the owner of the MS., a Hungarian family. According to Hottinger (in *Bibliothecario Quadripartito*, p. 158, ed. Turic.), the name ought to be זנדיקי instead of זנבוקי, which is equivalent to Zadduki or Sadducee.   Dr. Baer, in a private note to Prof. Strack, remarks, "זנבוקי I have not as yet found cited in any codex. It seems to me to be the name of a place like חומש יריחו (perhaps the Italian Subiako?)."   Mons. Fourmont, in his *Dissertation sur les manuscrits Hébreux ponctués et les anciennes éditions de la Bible* (in *Mémoires de littérature* l. l. xix. 236) says: " Les Rabbins font mention de plusieurs exemplaires de ces manuscrits authentiques, et placés à

[2] See also my art. *Sanbuki Codex* in McClintock & Strong's *Cyclop.*

dessein en différens endroits connus; celui d' Hillel par exemple, à
Tolède pour l' Espagne; celui de la captivité d' Egypte, au mont Sinai;
celui de Ben Ascher, à Jérusalem; et l'exemplaire appelé Drenvouki à
la Carthage, dans la contrée nommée Zevegitana." The codex is
quoted in the margin of some MSS., as in Codex Kennic. 415; Cod.
Kennic. 8 (Bibl. Bodl. Hunting, 69; comp. Brunsius *Ad. Kenn., Diss.*
Gener. p. 345). Besides this codex is quoted three times by Menachem
di Lonzano, in his commentary *Or Thora*, as on

Gen. ix. 14.—בְּעַנְנִי where he remarks (fol. 2ᵇ fin. ed. Amstel.):
בהללי הנין בשוא לבד ובונבוקי בשוא הפתח *i. e.*, in the Codex Hillel
the *nun* has the *sh'va* (:), but in the Codex Sanbuki the *sh'va* with the
patach.

Lev. xiii. 20.—שָׁפֵל (fol. 14ᵇ), שפל בונבוקי הפא בפתח *i. e.*, in
the Codex Sanbuki the פ in שֵׁפֶל is written with the *patach*.

Lev. xxvi. 36.—וְהֵבֵאתִי (fol. 15ᵇ), ו אך · · · בתי נעיא ואשכנו " בסס
בהללי ובירושלמיים יבונבוקי לא יש *i. e.*, in the Spanish and German
MSS. there is a *gaya* (*i. e.*, a *metheg*) under the ה , but not so in the
Codd. Hillel, Jerusalem and Sanbuki.

The Jericho Pentateuch.

Concerning this חוּמָשׁ יְרִיחוֹ Elias Levita writes thus: The Penta-
teuch of Jericho is doubtless a correct codex of the Pentateuch derived
from Jericho. It discusses the *plene* and *defectives* as הַתּוֹעֵבֹת." the
abominations" (Lev. xviii. 27), which is in this Pentateuch without the
second *vau*. So also יְלִידֵי, which occurs twice in the same chapter
(Numb. xiii. 13, 22), of which the first is *plene* (written in the Jericho
codex), and the second *defective*.

The Codex Sinai.[3]

This codex, סֵפֶר סִינַי , which contains the Pentateuch, is a correct
codex, and treats on the variations of the accents, as וַיִּשְׁמַע , *and he*
heard (Exod. xviii. 1) has the accent *Gershaim*, but in Sinai it has
Rebiah; again, הַמִּדְבָּר , the *desert* (v. s.), has *Zakeph*, while in Sinai it
has *Zakeph gadol*. As to the name of the codex, whether it is so called
from the author or from the place where it was written, is a matter of
dispute. According to Levita, it would be the name of a codex. Fürst
(*Geschichte der Karäer*, I. 22, 138) thinks that this codex derives its
name from Mount Sinai, while Joseph Eshwe, the expositor of the
Massorah, in his *Mebin Chidoth* (מֵבִין הִידוֹת , Amst. 1765) on Exod.
xviii. 1, remarks: "As to the remark Sinai has *Rebia*, know that the
inventors of the vowel-points and accents were mostly from the spiri-
tual heads and the sages of Tiberias. Now the name of one of these

was Sinai, and he differed from the Masorah, which remarks that וישמע has Gershaim, and said that it has the accent Rebia." From this it will be seen that this great Massoretic authority does not take סיני as *Codex Sinaiticus*, but regards it as a proper name of one of the inventors of the vowel-points and accents. Delitzsch (in his Hebrew translation of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p. 41, note) thinks that the name ספר סיני *Sinai Codex*, refers rather to the place where it was written or found.

The Codex Ben-Naphtali.

Moses ben David Naphtali, a cotemporary of Ben-Asher, flourished about A. D. 900–960. He distinguished himself by his edition of a revised text of the Hebrew Scriptures in opposition to Ben-Asher, in which he had no great success, inasmuch as the different readings he collated and proposed are very insignificant, and are almost entirely confined to the vowel-points and accents. The codex itself is lost, but many of its readings are preserved, *e. g.* by Kimchi in his *Grammar and Lexicon*, while a complete list of these different readings is appended to Bomberg's and Buxtorf's Rabbinic, and to Walton's Polyglot Bible. Fürst, ln his *Concordance*, p. 137 sec. 48, has also given the variations between these two scholars.

The most important deviation of Ben-Naphtali from Ben Asher is the reading of שלהבת יה, Song of Songs viii. 6, as two words, whilst Ben-Asher reads it as one word שלהבתיה, which makes no difference in the meaning. In a very convenient form these variations are given by Baer and Delitzsch in their edition of the different parts of the Old Testament, on *Genesis* p. 81, *Job* p. 59, *Psalms* p. 136, *Proverbs* p. 55, *Isaiah* p. 90, *Minor Prophets* p. 90, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, p. 126.

Our printed editions follow for the most part the reading of Ben-Asher; very seldom, however, that of Ben·Naphtali is followed, with the exception of such codices as have the Babylonian system of punctuation, and which always follow Ben-Naphtali. The editions in which the reading שלהבת יה (*i. e.*, Ben Naphtali's) is found, are: *Bomberg's* Rabbinic (1517) and his quarto edition (1518); *Stephen's* (1543), *Münster's* (1546), *Hutter* (1587), *Antwerp Polyglot* (1571), *Bragadin's* Hebrew Bible (1614), *Simoni's* (1767–1828), *Jahn's* (1806), *Bagster's* (1839), *Basle* edition (1827), *Hahn-Rosenmüller's* (1868).

---

[3] See also my art. *Sinai Codex Hebrew* in McClintock & Strong.

ברא in Josh. xvii. 15, 18, and Ezek. xxi. 24, xxiii. 47.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.

In these four verses the Piel of ברא occurs five times. It occurs nowhere else in the sacred Hebrew. These five instances are of interest mainly as evidence on the question whether the current Hebrew word for "create" has any more primitive signification, which requires to be considered in determining its scope.

When we think of God as originating anything, we may or may not, at the same time, think of the mediate processes, the secondary causes, if such exist, through which he originates it. When we think of divine origination apart from all mediate processes and second causes, we have in mind substantially the notion denoted by the Qal, the Niphal and the substantive of the Hebrew root ברא. These words are indeed employed in many instances in which the origination is from preëxisting materials, and through the agency of second causes; but in these instances the word calls attention, not to the preëxisting materials and the secondary causes, but to the fact that the origination is distinctively divine.

It will hardly be disputed that this usage is absolutely uniform. Gesenius, indeed, in three instances, assigns to the Niphal the meaning " to be born," or " to be begotten." In Ezek. xxi. 35 (xxi. 30, Eng.) he would, apparently, translate the language concerning the Ammonite, " I will judge thee in the place where thou *wast born*, in the land of thy nativity." But, not to criticize this translation in any other particular, the passage becomes far more graphic and not a whit less clear if we assign to ברא its usual sense, and make the meaning to be, " I will judge thee in the place where *God originated thee*, in the land of thy nativity." Similarly, when it is said of the King of Tyrus, Ezek. xxviii. 13, " in the day thou wast created," the meaning " in the day when God originated thee " is not less forcible or appropriate than the meaning " when thou wast begotten." And the same is equally true of the expression in Ps. civ. 30, " Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created." There is no exception to the statement that in the Qal, the

Niphal and the substantive בְּרִיאָה , once used, this root describes distinctive divine origination.

Are we to rest content with this, therefore, as the proper meaning? Or are we to look for some more ultimate signification, from which this is derived?

The current answer to this question is that we must look for such a meaning,—the meaning commonly settled upon being "to cut," "to cut out," and hence "to fashion."

If this were held as a mere etymological conjecture, it would hardly be worth while to dispute it. If ברא originally meant "to carve," that would not change the fact that its current meaning in the sacred Hebrew is "to originate divinely." One might hold that the word had primarily a physical signification, and yet hold that that signification has practically vanished from view beneath the meaning to the conveying of which the word has become set apart. One might distinctly recognize divine origination as the true and only meaning of the word, and yet curiously note the probability that the word which the Hebrew Bible has selected to express this idea is a word which once meant "to whittle."

But it is one thing thus to accept this etymology as the plausible conjecture which, perhaps, it is; and quite another thing to regard it as a fact well enough attested to compel us to modify our definitions of the words of this root, and our opinions as based thereupon. In the question whether God's originating of heaven and earth is from nothing, this supposed primitive notion of carving or cutting out has been made to do duty in a great variety of forms. It is likely to play a yet more important part in the question how far the Old Testament conceptions, of any given date, are to be regarded as gross and materialistic, or how far they are to be understood as being on the same spiritualistic plane with those of the New Testament. An etymology which might be accepted as a mere matter of curious conjecture, does not thereby acquire a title to be counted as positive evidence in important matters. We raise the question, not whether the etymology in question is true or false, but whether it is well enough attested to justify the basing of important conclusions upon it. As a part of the answer to this question, we are to examine the five instances in which the Piel of ברא occurs in the sacred Hebrew.

Apart from these five instances, the evidence commonly cited to prove that ברא primarily means to cut, is certainly of the most slender description. It is composed mostly of particulars which might have some validity to confirm other proof, if there were any other proof for them to confirm, but which, standing alone, are too weak to support themselves.

Of this sort, for instance, is the presumption that the idea of divine origination is too refined an idea to have been primitively expressed;

and that men must, therefore, have reached this idea through physical images, and must have expressed it at first in terms which had been previously employed in a physical meaning. Certainly, it is not always true that the conception of immaterial things is preceded by, and dependent upon, physical images. Children and savages do abstract thinking as really as civilized men. There is no absurdity in supposing that some early Semites got into their minds, with great distinctness, the idea that God, in originating things, may act differently from men, and somehow came to associate with this idea a pair of syllables which they had not hitherto appropriated for any other purpose, and thus found themselves in possession of the group of words which centre in the root ברא. And if this presumption is thus not very strong in favor of any physical origin of the word, it is immeasurably weaker as in favor of this particular physical origin of it, since it may be possible to devise many other hypotheses, each as plausible as this.

Gesenius finds evidence of the primitive meaning "to cut," in the existence of the adjective בריא, and the corresponding Hiphil, of which he says: "To feed, to eat, to grow fat, from the idea of cutting up food." Now if it were proved that בריא is from this verb ברא, and that the verb means, "to carve," we might accept this explanation, in the absence of any better guess by which to harmonize the violent incongruity of the two meanings. But it can hardly be taken as very weighty proof either that the words belong to the same root, or that the supposed common root primarily denotes the operation of cutting. Many scholars, certainly, regard the words as belonging to different roots.

The fact that the initial syllable בְּ or פְּ occurs in a few other words which mean to *separate*, or *break*, or something of that sort, might be of value in filling the gaps of a wall of evidence which was otherwise complete, but can hardly be counted unless there be such a wall, with the gaps in it to fill.

The Arabic analogies, though of the nature of remote evidence, might yet be decisive if the Hebrew usage were too scant to judge from; but the Hebrew usage, in this case, extends to nearly sixty instances. Again, the Arabic analogies might be decisive as between two conflicting interpretations of the Hebrew usage, or as complementing a strong body of evidence from that usage, in any given direction; but here there is no conflict of usage, and no evidence from Hebrew usage to complement, unless it be found in the instances in which the Piel is used.

Finally, the fact that בֵּר, *son*, has the same letters as the first two radicals of ברא may be harmonized equally with the supposition that the original signification of the root is that of cutting, or with any one of several other suppositions.

It appears, then, that the decision of the whole question turns upon

the usage of the Piel of בָּרָא. If this affords evidence of weight, and of a certain character, in favor of the alleged primary physical meaning, its evidence may possibly be so supplemented and confirmed by the other items of evidence, as to become very strong, perhaps even decisive. But if this source of evidence is found to be empty, then all the others are empty.

Professor Green, in his larger Hebrew Grammar, page 102, counts the Piel of this verb as an intensive: "בָּרָא *to create*, as God, Pi. *to form* with pains and labour, as man." This notion is at least a possible one, and is equally so whether we suppose the meaning of the Piel to have been derived from that of the Qal, or that of the Qal from that of the Piel, or each from some more primitive meaning of the root. But if all the instances of the Piel which occur are such as may derive their meaning directly from the well-known meaning of the Qal, this would seem to be the preferable explanation.

בָּרָא, in the Qal, expresses divine origination. The creation of the heavens and the earth is the instance of divine origination which has mainly attracted the attention of mankind. In our thoughts of creation two conceptions are especially prominent, namely, the reducing of chaos to order, and the construction of the world and its contents. Evidently, a derivative from the verb which expresses these ideas might appropriately describe men as reducing confused elements to order, or as constructing plans or objects.

We turn now to the direct consideration of the instances. The events recorded in Joshua are substantially the following. Certain cities which fell within the proper boundary of Manasseh, to the South, were given to Ephraim. In compensation there were assigned to Manasseh, six cities of Issachar and Asher, with the territory surrounding them. These lay mostly on eminences in the valley of Jezreel, and in the valleys opening from Jezreel, toward Jordan and toward the Mediterranean. This was, in theory, a good arrangement for both Ephraim and Manasseh; but practically it was discounted by the fact that the Canaanite lowlanders had chariots of iron. In the circumstances, the tribe of Joseph remonstrated with Joshua, saying that they had but one lot, which was not enough for them, because they were a great people whom God had blessed hitherto. "And Joshua said unto them: 'If thou art a great people get thee up toward the forests and *make a clearing for thyself there* (וּבֵרֵאתָ לְךָ שָׁם) in the land of the Perizzite and the Rephaim, since the mountain country of Ephraim is narrow for thee.'" The men of Joseph rejoined that the mountain country was not altogether theirs, and that the men of Beth Shean and the Jezreelite valley had chariots of iron, which rendered that part of their possessions quite unavailable. "And Joshua said to the house of Joseph, to Ephraim and to Manasseh, saying: 'Thou art a great people, and great strength is thine: thine will not be one lot; for a mountain district will

be thine, since it is a forest and *thou wilt make it a clearing* (וּבֵרֵאתֹו),
and its outlets will be thine since thou wilt bring the Canaanite into
possession, because he has chariots of iron, because he is strong.'"

Now, however men may differ here as to the cast of the events, or
the translation, or as to whether the forest here spoken of is literal
forest, or a figure of speech for the Perizzites and Rephaim, there is no
doubt in the mind of any one that this word בֵּרֵאתָ , 2d pret. sing.
masc. Piel of בָּרָא is here used in the sense of *making a clearing* in a
forest. It is also evident that if בָּרָא means *to cut*, its intensive mean-
ing, *to cut by the wholesale*, would be quite appropriate to the kind of
cutting by which a forest is cleared. It is equally manifest that if the
speaker on this occasion was a man who was accustomed to think of
God's creating the world as his clearing away of the elements of chaos
and confusion, and reducing them to order, he might very appropriately
have exhorted the boastful tribe of Joseph to cease complaining, and
show their greatness by creating habitable country out of that part of
their assigned territory which was then unfit for their habitation. This
meaning fits the context at least as well as the other.

It is further evident that the thing here mainly intended is the clear-
ing, and not the cutting process by which the clearing is effected. The
Septuagint and Vulgate both distinctly recognize this. The Septuagint
translates ἐκκάθαρον and ἐκκαθαριεῖς. The Vulgate translates, not, as
is often asserted, by *succido*, "to cut down," but by the phrases, "suc-
cide tibi spatia," "succides tibi atque purgabis ad habitandum spatia."

The instance in Ezek. xxiii. 47 is substantially parallel. In it the fate
of Aholah and Aholibah is thus described: "And an assembly shall hurl
stone upon them, and [shall proceed to] *clear them off* (וּבָרֵא אֹותְהֶן)
with their swords; their sons and their daughters they shall kill, and
their houses they shall burn with fire." Here, as in the instances in
Joshua, it is easy to explain בֵּרֵא as meaning to hack or to cut down.
But if there is any cutting here, no stress is laid upon it. The stress is
laid upon the clearance that is to be made of all the kindred of the two
harlots. The prominent thought is of the bringing of order out of dis-
order, through these severe measures.

In the parallel passage in Ezek. xvi. 40, "And they shall bring up
upon thee an assembly, and they shall stone thee with stones, and
slaughter thee with their swords, and burn thy houses," &c., the verb is
בָּתְקוּ , which occurs nowhere else, and whose meaning will follow the
meaning assigned to בֵּרֵא in the passage in hand.

The punishment here described is like that assigned to apostacy in
Deut. xiii. 10, 15, 16, in which the person who has been guilty is to be
put to death by stoning, but in the case of an apostate city, the inhabit-
ants and cattle are to be slain with the sword, and the spoil heaped up
in the midst of the city, and burned along with the houses.

Ezek. xxi. 24 may be thus translated: " Now do thou, O son of man, set for thee two ways for the sword of the king of Babylon to enter: from one land let both of them go forth: and *construct* (וּבָרֵא) a hand

(or, by hand), at a head of a way of a city *construct:* a way thou wilt set for a sword to enter Rabbath of the sons of Ammon and Judah that is fortified in Jerusalem."   Then the text speaks of the king of Babylon stopping at the junction of two roads, to decide, by divination, along which he will pursue his conquests.

There are differences of opinion as to the syntax and the meaning of this, but they do not affect the use here made of בָּרֵא .   The view taken

by Schröder may answer the purpose as well as any.   He supposes that the prophet is "to place before himself on a table or tablet a sketch of the nature mentioned."   On this tablet he is to construct a " hand," that is a finger-post or something of that kind, at the head of the two ways in the sketch.   The thing described by בָּרֵא is this constructing pro-

cess.   It is easy to connect with it the idea of cutting, by saying that the " hand " or the sketch itself was to be engraved on the tablet.   It is equally easy to derive the idea of construction, on the part of man, from that of the divine creative construction.

Substantially the same analysis will apply, if we suppose that the prophet is directed to construct an actual monument of some sort at the junction of two actual roads.   We can connect the idea of cutting with his act, by supposing that the monument is to be hewn out of wood or stone, but, as in the former interpretation, it is the construction, and not the cutting process, which is essential to the writer's meaning.

On the evidence, it is not claimed that the current etymology of בָּרָא is disproved.   But it is claimed that this etymology is not solidly enough grounded to make it a safe basis for important arguments.

The Syriac Apocalypse.

BY PROF. ISAAC H. HALL, PH. D.

I.—*Source of the Text.*

The Apocalypse forms no part of any of the Syriac versions of the New Testament to which we are accustomed to give a collective name. That is, it does not exist in the Peshitto, the Harklensian, the Jerusalem, or the Curetonian. The Peshitto version is now universally provided with a supplement, comprising the Apocalypse and the lacking Epistles (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude); but at least eight editions* appeared without it. In 1599 Elias Hutter first supplied these missing books (along with the Epistle to the Laodiceans in *Greek*, &c.), in his dodecaglott New Testament, in Syriac of his own making.

But Hutter's version has not held any important place. In 1627, Louis de Dieu published the Apocalypse at Leyden (Elzevirs, 4 to.), from a MS. that had been bequeathed to the University of Leyden by Joseph Scaliger; and in 1630 Edward Pococke published (also at Leyden, Elzevirs, 4 to.) the four lacking Epistles, from a MS. in the Bodleian library at Oxford. Since then these five books have been published with the Peshitto version, so as to furnish a complete Syriac New Testament; but no new sources of the text have been used. The later editors, moreover, have not scrupled to change or add to the vocalizing, nor to correct what they supposed to be manifest errors; yet not so far as to supply some of the larger palpable omissions in the Apocalypse.

---

* These were those of Widmanstadt, 1565; Tremellius, 1568 (9), 1571; Plantinus (Guido le Fevre de la Boderie—Antwerp Polyglott), 1571; Plantinus, *n. d.* [*circ.* 1573], 8 vo., 1575, 16 mo.; Paris (Guido le F. de la B.), 1584; Trost, 1621 (22).

It is the purpose of this paper to discuss certain matters connected with the Syriac Apocalypse; especially those which concern its origin, its place with reference to the Syriac versions of the bulk of the New Testament, and its general value, so far as they can be learned from internal evidence.

A word about the external evidence is, however, first in order.   In the edition just mentioned, in his dedicatory letter to Daniel Heinsius, De Dieu says of the MS.: "inter libros, à magno illo litterarum omnium lumine Josepho Scaligero Academiæ huic nostræ legatos, latere manuscriptum exemplar Syriacæ versionis Apocalypseos."   In the "Præfatio ad candidum Lectorem," he describes it farther: "this little book which we are editing was obtained from our public library, where, among many other noble books bequeathed to our University by the illustrious Joseph Scaliger, it lay long concealed hitherto.   It is a little book in octavo, of thick, stiff and polished paper, very nearly like parchment, written in an elegant and truly Syrian hand, but very different from this [printed] character of ours. It seems to be the hand which the Maronites employ in writing letters, where they use characters more compact, and often united in ligatures.   We do not find the vowels added, except in a few places, where you will find them printed.   The book has no versicular division of its own, nor of chapters either, except where they have been written in numerals of our fashion by some unknown reader.   Nevertheless, it has various division marks for the sentences, of which some seem to mark the longer, others the shorter periods.   These we have here omitted without scruple, both because the printer did not have them, and also because we did not discover any fixed use of them. For sometimes a whole page has none, sometimes one [page] has many, and not seldom accumulated for the sake of elegance alone, without any distinction of sense.   The first sort are made of four red points in quadrangular form about a black circle made in an oval shape; the second sort, of four points alone, the two vertical ones in red, the others horizontal, black.   Some are denoted [by us] in one way, others in another.   . But the rest of the distinctions of the parts and members of the sentence we have observed as well as we could. Of the author of this version we are ignorant; but the name of the writer of the book we have found at the end of the book, where he names himself 'Caspar born ܠܘܳܡܰܪܘ܂ ܐܺܠܺܙ ܤܟ', but is silent as to the time of the subscription of the book."

This subscription, as De Dieu translates it, reads: "Orate pro eo qui scripsit, Casparo, ex regione Hanravitarum." But it had been

conjectured by many (as Le Croze, *Hist. du Christianisme des Indes*, à La Haye, 1724, p. 230, and note (c)), and has been shown by Tregelles (Treg. Horne's *Introd.*, iv., p. 280), that the last word read "Indians" instead of "Hanravites"; the difference being caused by De Dieu's mistaking a *dolath* for a *rish*, by overlooking the point beneath, and then seeing too much in the plural points above.

This MS. was also examined by Tregelles, who says (Treg. Horne, *Introd.*, iv. p. 280), that it "is now No. 18 amongst Scaliger's MSS. at Leyden. It is written on thickish glazed paper, of a small size; the ink is black and distinct, though the corrections in the margin are of a much fainter colour. It is carelessly written, and when the present writer examined it at Leyden, it seemed to have altogether a modern appearance."

There exist a pretty fair set of clues to the date of this MS. The Latin title of a Syriac Liturgy in the library of the Waisenhaus at Halle "says that the book was copied by Gaspar, an Indian of Malabar, at Rome, in 1580" (Tregelles, *ubi supra*). "There is also a MS. at Florence, containing the same version of the Apocalypse in Syriac, also transcribed by this same Caspar in the year 1582" (*idem*. conf. also Le Croze, *ubi supra*). The subscription to this last MS. states that it was copied from a MS. in the writing of Thomas of Harkel, in A. D. 622. But too much confidence should not be placed in this statement; for such statements have many times been copied from an older subscription, and even transferred from one MS. to another of a very different character. The date of 622 is worth notice, however, as it is the same which Ridley's MS. gives to the translation of John viii. 1–11, which has been published in White's edition of the Harklensian version. (See Tregelles, *ubi supra*, and pp. 281, 282; also in Smith's *Bible Dict.*, Amer. ed., iv. p. 3394. I cite Tregelles, because his account is generally clearest and most comprehensive; though it would be easy to cite a whole series of writers, from Adler down.)

However, though written in the latter part of the sixteenth century, these MSS. of the Apocalypse seem to be copies of an ancient version. Two Brit. Mus. MSS., brought to light by B. Harris Cowper, one (eleventh century) containing the text, another (fourteenth century) a commentary, seem to have a text identical with that of the printed editions. (See Smith's *Bible Dict.*, Amer. ed., iv. p. 3394, note *a*.) Another MS., once owned by Ussher, by him sent to De Dieu, but now lost, contained the Apocalypse (Treg. Horne, *Introd.*,

iv. pp. 282, 284); but whether it contained the rest of the New Test-ament, as sometimes supposed, is uncertain. From the language both of De Dieu* and of Ussher† nothing is certain beyond the fact that the MS. contained the fragment, John vii. 53 to viii. 11, with 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, the Apocalypse, and a small tractate of Ephrem Syrus. I incline strongly to the opinion that the MS. con-tained no more—except that the fragment from John goes on with verse 12 for a few words, and ends with ܘܣܝܒܐ, the Syriac "&c."

De Dieu could conjecture nothing as to the age of the Syriac Apocalypse, though he rightly supposed it to have been made di-rectly from the Greek. A *quotation* from chap. vii. 14, in the Syriac Grammar (Rome, 1596) of George Michael Amira of Edessa, a Lebanon Maronite, De Dieu found to be literally the same in this version; and he supposed that Amira would not have quoted from the late Jesuit version, turned into Syriac from the Latin Vulgate. J. J. Assemâni (*Biblioth. Orient.*, iii., pt. 2, p. ccxxxii.) conjectured that it was made by Mar Abba (patriarch of the East); but that con-jecture seems to be groundless. Others suppose that the version is part of the Harklensian recension of the Philoxenian; others, that it differs as much from the Harklensian as it does from the Peshitto.

In preparing this paper, necessity confines me to the printed edi-tions, and to a portion of them. For the general basis, I have used the original edition of De Dieu, text and notes; chiefly for the reason that it is nearest to the MS. of any edition we have, but also because it appears, on examination, to be a very careful, conscientious, and scholarly piece of work. This edition contains the Syriac text; the same transliterated into Hebrew characters, with a vocalization after the Syriac analogy; an exact Latin translation; and the common Greek text (almost exactly the Elzevir of 1624). De Dieu's own account is worth transcribing. In his "Præfatio," after mentioning the facts last stated, he says: "Textum Syriacum fideliter descripsi, descriptum contuli, relictis etiam mendis quæ occurrebant, quæ tamen, ne lector alicubi offenderet et hæreret, hujusmodi signo †

Commentarius in Johann., ad Cap. vii. 53, where the fragment is published. The Syriac ends with "&c."; and De Dieu remarks at the end of his translation, "Hactenus Fragmentum illud Syriacum." *Conf.* also his remarks in the Dedication to Abp. Ussher of his *Animadv. in Acta App.*, and especially the *Præf. in quatuor Evv.* All these are in his *Critica Sacra.*

† Letter to Dr. Samuel Ward, quoted from Todd's *Life of Walton* in Smith's *Bible Dict.*, Amer. ed., iv. p. 3394, note *b.*

notavi, et in charactere Hebræo ad idem signum, nisi fallor, emen-
davi, quod doctiorum judicio libenter submitto, à quibus hic repre-
hendi neutiquam erubescam.   Ubi verba quædam ad sensum perfici-
endum deessent, id hujusmodi signo [ ] spatio aliquo vacuo relicto,
indicavi, et in charactere Hebræo ex Græco supplevi.   Non est au-
tem dissimulandum, in ipsius autographi margine errata varia à lec-
tore quodam nescio quo, sed alia manu, alio atramento emendata
conspici: idem, verba quædam in autographo occurrisse redundantia
aut bis scripta, quæ nos è textu resecuimus: quæ tamen singula, ne
quid fraudis commississe videamur, in animadversionibus nostris suis
locis observavimus."   All which appears to be very carefully and con-
scientiously done.   The words which follow are also worth quoting,
for they show that he had the true spirit of a faithful critic: "Uti-
nam vero alia quædam exemplaria cum quibus hoc nostrum con-
ferre potuissemus, ad manum fuissent errata exactius corrigere, ac
defectus melius supplere potuissemus."*

Upon close examination, however, the edition of De Dieu affords
some means of judging both the character of his printed edition and
that of the MS. it represents.   The printed edition, as already said,
is a work careful and scholarly, and the apparent misprints are few.
The conjectural alterations are plain restorations in matters of cer-
tainty, but even so, they are scrupulously mentioned in his notes.
They are generally no more than the restoration of a *rish* for a *dolath*,
or the supplying of an obviously omitted letter, or the change of a
diacritic point.   Yet even this much is done but rarely, although a
marginal correction in the MS. would have authorized more.   The
Syriac text is usually kept faithfully, and the corrections are left to be
made in the notes, or in the transliteration in Hebrew letters.   The
misprints are fewer than those of its reprint by Gerardus Borstius, ap-
pended to the second edition of De Dieu's *Critica Sacra* (Amsterdam,
1693, fol.).

In the same connection, it is to be remarked that all the editions
of the Syriac Apocalypse, in the New Testaments and Bibles, though

---

* Ussher sent him the other MS. in 1631, from which Ussher had
thought the Apocalypse published at Leyden might be amended.   De
Dieu purposed a new edition of the Apocalypse, and "ex altero hoc ex-
emplari emendare, et si quæ varia esset lectio, observare."   But other
labors hindered, and he seems never to have taken the work actually in
hand.   In 1634 (*Epist. Dedicat. in Act. Apost.*) he regrets his unful-
filled intentions concerning the Ussher MS.; but the next year he died,
swept away by the plague of 1635-36.

having only De Dieu's edition as their original basis, have added many conjectural emendations. In consequence, most of the critical notes appended to subsequent editions—those of Gutbier, Schaaf, and Bagster, for instance—record nothing but variant editorial conjectures. Sometimes, too, these represent matters wrongly, and credit De Dieu with a misprint not his own. For example, in chap. ii. 12 is a misprint in Gutbier and others for the word which renders ὀξεῖαν, with a note giving the true reading, and crediting it only to the London Polyglott. But the London Polyglott simply follows De Dieu (that is, MS. authority), while Gutbier has committed an unmeaning, if not arbitrary, error. Other editions, as Schaaf, note the reading given by Gutbier, and leave it to be inferred that De Dieu was in fault.

Of the extant editions, perhaps that in the quadrilingual edition of Reineccius (N. T., 1713; whole Bible, with N. T. again, 1747, Lips. fol.) gives the closest aid to one who wishes to know the MS. text, and has not De Dieu himself to refer to.

Warning might here be given, also, that not even Tischendorf's Gr. T., ed. viii., *crit. maj.*, gives a perfect account of the MS. readings of the Syriac Apocalypse. Though his notes are careful, his work does not cover all the testimony of the Syriac, while it contains a number of slips. For example, at chap. xxii. 11, we find "syr polygl (non Schaaf) ταυτης"; but here Schaaf follows the MS., and the Polyglott had made an arbitrary emendation. Again, at xx. 13, we find Tischendorf saying: "και ο θανατ. και usque τα εργα αυτων . . . syr om"; but the Syriac does *not* omit, either in De Dieu, or in Schaaf, whom Tischendorf usually follows.

But, not to pursue this matter farther, no great fault can be found with De Dieu's ability nor his manner of editing.

II.—*Character of the Diplomatic Evidence.*

As to the character of the MS. itself, we have the word of Tregelles (Treg. Horne's *Introd.*, iv. p. 280) that it is "carelessly written"; but that may mean little more than that the penmanship is rapid, and the hand is the epistolary one; as indeed De Dieu says, above. Tregelles also says (*idem*) that "it seemed to have altogether a modern appearance"; which may refer to the same thing; for though "the ink is black and distinct," yet "the corrections in the margin are of a much fainter colour." Moreover, Tregelles knew and mentioned, as stated above, the other means of determining the age of the MS.

It is not to be expected, of course, that even so short a MS. as one of the Apocalypse should be without its oversights. How many and of what sort these are, is best determined by an examination throughout; in which reference must be had not only to De Dieu's notes and the palpable errors, but also to the character of the text it represents.

Many of his notes of its apparent imperfection depend upon its variation from the Greek text which he published along with it. As this text is almost exactly that of the Elzevir N. T. of 1624,* varying only in certain inconsiderable minutiæ or oversights, it is natural that many things which De Dieu considered as variations from the Greek, or as imperfections of his MS., would now be thought marks of its better character. In sundry cases, too, where the Syriac has a shorter reading, agreeing with the better texts, De Dieu sagaciously remarked, "pro eo [*sc.* Græco] simpliciter est in exemplari nostro" (as at iii. 12), or the like; and that, of course, without knowing of the better reading. The residue of De Dieu's notes, or, at least, those which remain to be taken into account, refer to errors in diacritic points, or others which are manifest and self-correcting, or else those of greater moment, corrected in the MS. margin.

Other MS. errors are to be detected by a comparison with the Greek text. This, again, involves a rough determination of the form of the Greek text which the Syriac follows; even though, as Tregelles asserts, "its internal character and the nature of its text, as well as the want

---

*As more exact information may be desired respecting the Greek text of De Dieu, I will state that a careful collation with the Elzevir N. T. of 1633 discloses only about 38 differences, of which only two amount to a real variant, viz.: xvi. 5, D has ὁ ὅσιος for E ὁ ἐσόμενος, and xx. 8, D omits τὸν before *Μαγὼγ*. There are only two differences by misprint of a letter, viz.: vi. 11, D has πληρώσωνται for E —σονται; and xvi. 21, χαλώζης for χαλάζης. The other differences are in the use of capital letters (D having Πνεῦμα for πν. in a number of places, and ἀμήν once for 'Αμήν), in punctuation (only one causing a real difference, viz.: xviii. 18, D μεγάλη; for E —λη,), in the separation of the parts of compound or *quasi*-compound words (as vii. 3, D μή τε for E μήτε *secund.*; or xvii. 7, Διατί for E Διὰ τί), in the different breathing of αυτος (xiv. 14, D χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, E χειρὶ αὑτοῦ), or in a wrongly placed or an omitted accent. The variant in xvi. 5 seems to show that De Dieu had simply taken the Elzevir text of 1624. The variant in xx. 8 is probably a happy misprint.——In this connection it may be well to state that Pococke's Greek text of the Epistles, printed at the same establishment in 1630, exhibits generally the Elzevir text, with a few modifications apparently from the Antwerp Polyglott.

of all external credentials, place it indefinitely low as to critical value" (Treg. Horne's *Introd.*, iv. 282.)

As to the basis of the statements to follow, I have compared the two editions of De Dieu, text and notes; also the first edition with the Greek text and marginal notes of Von Gebhardt's Tischendorf's Gr. N. T., and with the text and notes of Tischendorf's N. T. ed. viii. *crit. maj.;* I have also carefully collated the Greek text of De Dieu's first edition with the Elzevir of 1633, and obtained comparisons with the Elzevir of 1624; besides abundant collation and comparison with the later Syriac editions. To present a full statement of the facts thus obtained would require a space many times greater than the whole of this paper; and therefore I keep myself mostly to examples or generals.

In the matter of diacritic points and vowels, the MS. seems to be moderately, but not abundantly, supplied; but I would not call its care or correctness therein extreme. The slips in this respect, as well as in the omission or addition of a letter here and there, seem to show the work of a *mere* copyist; and yet not of a very careless one. Accordingly, I would not place too much stress upon the testimony of this MS. in those respects. For instance, in chapter i. 3, where the plural points make the Greek read τοὺς λόγους, with Tregelles and W. and Hort, as against the τὸν λόγον of Von G.'s Tischendorf, I might regard it as of some weight; but where it omits the plural points in cases where the Greek text requires them, I should not regard it. Such cases are ii. 23, making the reading καρδίαν for καρδίας; or vii. 14, στολὴν for στολάς; or in xvii. 2, so as to read ὁ βασιλεὺς for οἱ βασιλεῖς. So when it has the plural points in a case where it *might* leave them off, I should regard its testimony of little account. A case of this sort occurs in the rendering of τοῦ ψευδοπροφήτου in xvi. 13. Here the two portions of the compound word are separated, as necessary in Syriac, and plural points are over the word for ψευδο-. Without them the word is doubtless adjective, and means "lying" or "false"; but with the points it must be noun, meaning "lies." But the construction (omitting *dolath* prefix) seems to show that the word is adjective, and that the plural points are wrongly added.

As to letters either superfluous or omitted, I do not observe that they occur oftener than in other Syriac MSS. A plainly superfluous letter appears in ܥܠܘܬ for ܠܘܬ (πρὸς) in i. 17; since the suffix pronoun could not well remain without prefixing a *lomad* to the next

word (ܘܣܩܠܝܢ̈).   But examples of letters manifestly either super-
fluous or omitted are to be found in De Dieu's notes.   In several
cases the MS. margin makes the correction.   The most important
class of cases occurs in the addition or omission of the prefix *waw*,
i. e., the addition or omission of *καί*; and here, though the Syriac
idiom solves some cases, the Greek text must show us the certainty
or the probability.   The common addition or suppression of the
final *waw* in verb terminations has so many examples in Syriac MSS.
that I should not consider it a matter of moment in deciding upon
the character of the MS.   As to its effect on the testimony to the
Greek reading, it belongs to the class of standing ambiguities.

In sundry other matters, the Syriac idiom seems to require a varia-
tion from the Greek; which variation, accordingly, is only apparent.
Partly such is the rendering of a preliminary or circumstantial par-
ticiple by a finite verb and a conjunction, as in English.   This is
one of the matters wherein the Peshitto and the Harklensian versions
almost characteristically differ; the latter striving to conform to the
Greek, but oftenest with the addition of ܒܘ before the participle.
In the Apocalypse, as in the Harklensian, the Peshitto style is some-
times followed.   But a clearer case occurs in the phrase for δίστομος
ὀξεῖα (i. 16, ii. 12, xix. 15), where the Syriac requires the order of
words to be reversed, because δίστομος has to be represented by a
phrase, with also a suffix pronoun; and the sense would be marred
by keeping the Greek order.   There are also cases where the Syriac
had some choice in rendering, and followed a form which would
render equally well two or more Greek variants.   These should be
excluded from consideration.

Apart from these venial imperfections in the Syriac MS., are now
to be noticed its more important defects.   Here, as already hinted, I
put aside its substituting shorter forms for the Elzevir text in sundry
cases, and remark, in general, that as between Von Gebhardt's Tis-
chendorf on the one hand and Tregelles on the other, it oftener
agrees with the former.   It also contains a number of readings of
the *Textus Receptus*, against all the critical editors just mentioned.
In other places it often sides with other authorities given in Tischen-
dorf's ed. viii. *crit. maj.*, especially with the other Oriental versions
(including the Egyptian).   In short, its text has what Westcott and
Hort would call a large Syrian element; but it is yet not utterly
Syrian or Western.   It seems, then, that the proper basis of deter-
mining the care of the scribe in this respect is to attend only to

those readings which appear to be singular; and of these I give some specimens; the Greek text of comparison being that of Von Gebhardt:

i. 4.   *om. καὶ ante ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτά*; involving one letter in Syriac.

i. 6.   *quasi βασιλείαν ἱερὰν pro β. ἱερεῖς.*   This is evidently a use of the adjective like that in the second conclusion of Mark, in White's Harklensian and the Greek of Codex L.   But as nearly the same phrase in v. 10 is rendered correctly after the Greek, this change *may* have been the work of a copyist.   Yet the use of the equivalent of ἱερὸς for ὅσιος was well established in Syriac before the Harklensian version was made.

i. 9.   *add. ὑμῶν post συνκοινωνός* (addition of a word).

i. 12.   *om. ἐμοῦ post μετ'* (a simple self-correcting error; omission of one letter).

ii. 1.   *παντοκράτωρ καὶ pro κρατῶν*; as if the Greek had added *πάντα καί*, simply.

ii. 4.   *om. ἀλλὰ ἔχω* (but the phrase shows that the Greek read at least ἔχω, as the omission is of two particles only).

ii. 4.   *om. τὴν ἀγάπην* (but the margin supplies it).

ii. 6.   *om. μισῶ.*

ii. 13.   ܐܬܠܐܝܬܐ *pro Ἀντείπας* (clear error of understanding, and doubtless due to the scribe.   The later editions vary this word somewhat, but generally still keeping it as a verb.   As it is, it changes the rendering into—*e. g.*, De Dieu's: "quibus spectaculum factus est ille testis meus"; omitting, of course, the proper name).

ii. 14.   ܠܥܡܘܣ *pro τῷ Βαλάκ.*   This combines two errors.   The original must have read ܠܒܥܡ (τῷ Βαράκ), and the scribe has made two very easy errors in copying.

ii. 14, 20.   ܘܒܢ̈ܝ ܦܬܟܪ̈ܐ (*sons of idols*) *pro εἰδωλόθυτα*; but the error *may* be De Dieu's, as he makes no note of any error here.   The mistake would be very easy for a printer; since the reading of the first word must have been ܘܒܚ̈ܢ (*sacrifices*) instead of ܘܒܢ̈ܝ (*of sons*). Unless a letter was faded, however, the mistake would be gross on the part of a native *scribe*.

(ii. 15, 16.   ὅμοιος is in verse 16 by punctuation, like the Vulgate Latin.)

ii. 18.   ἀγγέλῳ καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ . . . *pro ἀγγέλῳ τῆς . . . ἐκκλησίας* (plain error).

ii. 24.   ὡσ λέγομεν *pro ὡς λέγουσιν*; but this is probably De Dieu's error, as it consists only in mistaking a *nun* for a *yud;* a very easy thing.

ii. 27.   A clerical self-correcting error of one letter in the word for σιδηρᾷ (perhaps only a printer's error).

In chapter ii. I have here noted *all* the errors of moment; and they are nearly all so slight as to cause no trouble.   In chapter iii. the errors are a little more serious; yet appearing more so in the Greek than in the Syriac.   For example:

iii. 1.   τῷ (*solum*) *pro* τῆς   .   .   .   ἐκκλησίας.

iii. 2.   *quasi* τήρησον *vel* τήρει *pro* στηρίσον.

iii. 4.   An error of one letter in spelling, but corrected in the margin, for Σάρδεσιν.   (Yet this is singular, as it makes the reading "in Paradise" for "in Sardis.")

iii. 5.   πατρός μου *pro* π. αὐτοῦ (error of one letter).

iii. 8.   *add.* καὶ *ante* ἰδού (one letter added).

iii. 11.   Error, perhaps only of the printer, of one letter in word for τάχυ.

iii. 12.   *om.* (*homoioteleuton*) καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ θεοῦ μου.

iii. 15.   *om.* ψυχρὸς εἶ οὔτε (with MSS. of Mai's *Speculum*).

iii. 15.   ܩ *pro* ܩ for ὄφελον (as if the Greek read μὴ *pro* ὄφ.).

iii. 16.   *add.* ὅτι *ante* μέλλω (*ut videtur*).

iii. 21.   *add.* καὶ *ante* ὁ νικῶν.

iii. 22.   Phrase imperfect which renders ἔχων (*om.* ܢ).

iv. 6.   *add.* καὶ ἐνώπιον *post* κύκλῳ.

iv. 11.   *post.* πάντα *add.* καὶ διά σου εἰσιν.

These samples show the general nature of the imperfections, whether of the MS. or of De Dieu's copy.   For the rest, I shall confine myself to a selection of the more noticeable ones; omitting also the few transpositions of words, as also the (very few) cases which *may* show the influence of the Vulgate as against Greek MSS.   To continue:

v. 6.   *om.* (*homoiot.*) ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων.

v. 11.   λόγων *pro* ἀγγέλων (omission of two letters.   But a like example in viii. 10 seems to show that this was a contraction only).

v. 13.   *om.* λέγοντας.

vi. 1.   *om.* ἔρχου; but MS. supplies it in margin.

vi. 2.   ἦν (*vel* ἐγένετο) *pro* ἰδού (addition of one letter).

vi. 12.   αἷμα *pro* σεισμός (ܠܘܕ *pro* ܠܘܕ, showing a *late copyist*, but showing also that the archetype had the correct reading).   μαρτυρία *pro* σελήνη (ܣܘܡ *pro* ܣܘܡ).

vii. 4.   *om.* υἱῶν.

vii. 8.   *om.* ἐσφραγισμένοι.

vii. 14. "And she said" *pro* καὶ εἴρηκα (accidental change of one letter).

viii. 3. ἐνώπιον (ܩܕܡ) *pro* ἐστάθη (ܩܡ). (Wrong insertion of a letter.)

viii. 4. *om.* καὶ.

viii. 10. *om.* μέγας.

viii. 12. *ad* καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα *add.* ἐσκοτίσθη.

viii. 13. ἐν μεσουρανήματι is rendered by ܕܡܨܥܬܐ ܕܕܢܘܪܐ ܘܕܡܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ. In xiv. 6 the same is rendered by ܒܡܨܥܬܐ ܕܕܡܐ; but xix. 7 it is rendered correctly. The later editions modify somewhat, but retain the essential error. De Dieu's note is worth quoting from, as it gives a sufficient hint of the error: "Ita transtulit Syrus Græcum illud, ἐν μεσουρανήματι, ac si decompositum esset ex μέσος *medius*, οὐρά *cauda*, & αἷμα *sanguis*." His Latin rendering of this phrase is "medio caudæ, quæ sanguinem habet," which is strictly correct. The later modifications are worth looking at only as matter of curiosity.

ix. 11. ᾿Αβαδδών is curiously rendered by ܚܒܕܘ (*served*), instead of ܐܒܕܘ. The exchange of the initial letter hints at a *quasi* error of *sound*, especially as the Syriac kindred word to ᾿Αβαδδών is used to render ἀπώλεια (xvii. 8, 11). The omission of the final letter is probably a mere accident. On the whole, it seems as if the Syrian translator, or a scribe, had mistaken the Oriental word, and was intending to write the word for *servant*.

x. 6. μέγας (*vel* μέγιστος) *pro* χρόνος (easy error of ܙܒܢܬܐ *pro* ܪܒܬܐ).

x. 11. ἄρχουσι *pro* γλώσσαις (error of one letter and part of another).

xi. 5. πῦρ . . . θελήσῃ is transferred by mistake to verse 1 (*post* καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος of the received text), but the MS. has marks to indicate the correction.

xi. 6. *om.* τῆς προφητείας.

xi. 12. *om.* καί ἤκουσαν φωνῆς . . . λεγούσης αὐτοῖς.

xi. 13. *om.* τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

xi. 15. *om.* ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.

xii. 9, 11. διάβολος is rendered by ܡܣܟܝܢܐ (seductor *vel* impostor, *quasi a* ܣܟܝ βάλλω; "as if διάβολος were *disjector*." Compare ܐܬܪܡܝ *pro* ἐβλήθη in same connection). In xx. 2, but not xx. 10, the same rendering occurs.

xii. 16.   *om.* καὶ κατέπιεν τὸν ποταμὸν   .   .   .   τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.

xiii. 14.   *om.* (*homoiot.*) διὰ τὰ σημεῖα   .   .   .   ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.   (But Bᴿ, Vat. 2066 has the same.)

xiv. 7.   δουλεύετε (*vel* διακονεῖτε) *pro* φοβήθητε.   (Error of whole word; but easy to be made.)

xiv. 10.   θρόνου *pro* ἀρνίου.

xiv. 11.   *om.* (*homoiot.*) καὶ εἴ τις   .   .   .   ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ.

xiv. 13.   ἐν θεῷ *pro* ἐν Κυρίῳ.

xiv. 15.   *om.* πέμψον   .   .   .   τῆς γῆς.

xiv. 16.   *om.* ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης.

xiv. 20.   *om.* ἔξωθεν   .   .   .   ληνοῦ.

xvii. 1.   *om.* ὑδάτων. (but margin supplies it).

xvii. 11.   ἐστιν *pro* ὑπάγει.

xviii. 2.   πνεύματος, by error of one letter, is rendered ܟܢܦܐ, *quasi* "of wing" or "flying." The mistake is for ܪܘܚܐ, literally ἐν πνεύματι—itself a copyist's mistake.

xviii. 2.   *post* μεμισημένου *add.* καὶ φυλακὴ πάντος θηρίου ἀκαθάρτου καὶ μεμισημένου.

xviii. 9.   *post* κλαύσονται *add.* καὶ πενθοῦσι.

xviii. 17.   πλέων is rendered by a word meaning "swimming."

xix. 18.   καὶ σάρκας ἰσχυρῶν is repeated in the MS., but only printed once in De Dieu's edition.

xx. 3.   δὲ λυθήσεται *pro* δεῖ αὐτὸν λυθῆναι.   (A clear mistake of the translator; or rather, a misreading of the Greek.)

xxi. 6.   γέγονα ἐγώ *pro* γέγοναν.   (The sense intended is apparently *ego fui.*)

xxi. 17.   μέτρων (*vel* μέτροι), πηχῶν ἀνθρώπου *pro* πηχῶν, μέτρον ἀνθρώπου (perhaps only an idiomatic change).

xxi. 27.   *om.* καὶ ψεῦδος.

xxi. 27.   καὶ *pro* εἰ μή.

xxii. 11.   ὁ ἀδικῶν, by dropping one letter accidentally, is rendered by a word meaning *intrans* or *ascendens* (ܣܠܩ̇ *pro* ܣܟܠ̇).

xxii. 16.   ἐνώπιον τῶν ἐκκλησίων *pro* ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (perhaps idiomatic).

From these specimens several results are clear.   (1.) The original translator made a number of mistakes, some of which mislead, but some of which, again, by their very erroneous quality, give clear testimony to the Greek text followed.   (2.) The Leyden MS. is clearly a copy from some archetype of greater correctness, and every way

better than the extant copy.   (3.) De Dieu probably made a few
mistakes in transcribing or editing, which demand a re-examination
of the MS.   (4.) The MS. contains a few additions, and quite a
number of serious omissions, which seem chargeable to the copyist
rather than to the archetype.   (5.) The care with which the extant
copy is written is not extreme; nor, on the other hand, is its care-
lessness gross.   It compares favorably with the bulk of Syriac MSS.,
though many better Syriac Biblical MSS. exist.   The most evident
lack is that of a contemporary διορθώτης.   (6.) Its critical value is
not great enough to make it a strong reliance; since it does not give
either a complete or an accurate representation of the text.   But it
contains the substance well, and it is of value as testimony to the
text in use by the maker or makers of the version, and also, in a less
degree, to the genuine text of the Apocalypse.

In addition, it may be said that the rendering is generally very
close to the Greek; painfully close, indeed; and nothing at all like
the elegant idiomatic freedom of the Peshitto.   But more on this
last head will be found further on.

III.—*Place among the Syriac Versions.*

More interesting, however, than all the foregoing, are the ques-
tions: What place does the Syriac Apocalypse hold with respect to
the other Syriac versions ?   What is its age, and what style of thought
and spirit does it reflect ?   What is its position in Syriac literature ?
What grade or habit of the language does it typify?   These ques-
tions, if resolved at all, must be resolved solely by internal evidence,
and by comparison with other writings.   Standing alone as a Syriac
version of the Apocalypse, the comparison is more difficult, and de-
pends more upon the uncertain, and, so to speak, the second-hand,
considerations of style and usage, than upon matters tangible by
themselves as primary evidence.

It would be a waste of time to argue at length that the Apocalypse
is no part of the Peshitto, or of a version of equal date.   That is a
fact that lies upon the surface.   Nor can it be shown that any earlier
version underlay it as a basis.   Scattered notices in early Syriac
writers, notably Ephrem Syrus, prove that the Syrian fathers knew of
the existence, at least, of the Apocalypse, and perhaps—or probably
—had a Syriac version thereof.   It is true, also, that the Syriac
Apocalypse, in the version we know, must have had a wide, though
probably not a general, currency later; but like the Epistles 2 Peter,

and 2 and 3 John, and Jude, being no part of the principal version
(Peshitto), it suffered great neglect.   Indeed, of the Peshitto version
itself, certain Old Testament portions have been rare among the
Syrians.   MSS. of the Psalter have been most abundant, of the Pen-
tateuch less so, of the Prophets rare, of the Chronicles very rare, and
of the remaining books exceedingly rare.   (See, for an illustration,
Justin Perkins's *Eight Years in Persia*, p. 15.)   It is not at all sur-
prising that a portion of the New Testament which was not read in
the churches, which did not belong to the popular version, nor was
its equal in antiquity, should fall into disuse.

Concerning the origin (among the versions) of this Syriac Apoca-
lypse, two leading opinions seem to have been held.   One is ex-
pressed by Eichhorn as well as any one else (*Einleitung in das N. T.*,
ed. 1827, iv. pp. 459 ff.): "Erst seitdem die Philoxenische von
Thomas von Harkel überarbeitete Uebersetzung des N. T. bekannt
geworden ist, hat man entdeckt dass unsre gedruckte Syrische Apo-
kalypse ein Stück derselben seyn müsse."   His reasons are, first, the
subscription to the Florence Codex mentioned above (which, how-
ever, we cannot trust); next, its following the Harklensian style, as
he alleges, "in jeder Kleinigkeit," in the prevailing use of Greek
words, imitations of Greek structure, representations of the Greek
article by Syriac pronouns; next, its resemblance to an apparent re-
vision of the (supposed) fragments of the original Philoxenian pre-
served by Jacob of Edessa in his commentary on Genesis; and next,
in its supposed preservation of the critical marks of Origen in the
Florence codex, as shown by the example cited in Adler's *N. T. Ver-
siones Syriacæ*, p. 78.

All these arguments are good to a certain extent.   It is undeniable
that the genius of this version approaches the Harklensian nearer
than even the Pococke Epistles; which last, again, are not without
reason supposed to be a fragment of the original Philoxenian.   At
the same time, all analogy forbids the supposition that either the
Pococke Epistles or the Apocalypse were ever based upon a Peshitto
original.

The other opinion is well expressed by Adler (*N. T. Vers. Syr.* pp.
78, 79): "Sed tamen a genio Philoxenianæ versionis tantidem differt,
quantum a simplice.   Accusativum quidem, ut Philoxenus, per ܠ
præfixum exprimit, sed tot græcis verbis civitatem vel potius pere-
grinitatem non dedit, voces vel phrases origine syriacas reddidit, nulla
superfla explicatione addita . . . et alia multa, nomina propria
more Syrorum, non ad Græcorum pronunciationem scripsit, verbo,

litteris non tam anxie inhæsit quam Philoxenus.   Statuimus, hanc
Apocalypseos versionem ab alio quidem, quam versio syriaca vulgata
Evangeliorum, factam esse, sed Philoxenum auctorem non agnos-
cere." This opinion is held by Tregelles, and for the same reasons.
(See Treg. Horne's *Introd.*, iv. p. 281.)   Other critics might be
cited, but their opinions would add little on either side.

The investigation of the questions here presented involves much
labor, but results in little that can be presented particularly without
the recitation of long tabulated comparisons, with much other mate-
rial of the driest sort.   I have approached the subject by five lines of
comparison, as follows:

1. The proper names.
2. The use of Greek words in place of Syriac.
3. The use of peculiar Syriac words, which seem to characterize
respectively the Peshitto, the Harklensian, and the Pococke Epistles.
4. The use of structures and forms of expression which characterize
respectively the Peshitto, the Harklensian, the Pococke Epistles, and
secular Syriac literature as far as practicable.
5. The quotations from the Old Testament.   In these, if the phrase-
ology appears to coincide with that of the O. T. Peshitto, it would show
a familiarity with that version, and a measurable guidance thereby; but
if their alliance was clearly with the Hexaplar, the fact would show an
apparent posteriority to that version, and a consequent origin posterior
to both the Philoxenian and the Harklensian.

1.   As to the proper names.   Most of them are such as easily
show whether the Syriac fashion or the Harklensian distortion is fol-
lowed.   Jesus, Christ (Messiah), John, David, Israel, Jerusalem,
Satan, Babylon, Euphrates, the names of the cities of the Seven
Churches, Zion, Moses, Michael, Sodom, Egypt, Judah, Jews, the
names of the twelve tribes, Patmos, Magog, Gog, Nicolaitans, and
the like, follow the Syriac fashion generally, and not the Harklensian
or the Greek.   And the exceptions to the general rule seem rather to
show an independent rendering than a desire to reproduce the Greek
phenomena.   These exceptions are such as the following: the name
Balak (ii. 14) suffers a double mistake (see above); first, mistaking it
for Barak, or changing it by a natural Oriental permutation of the
liquids, and second by the transcriber's changing the *r* into *n* and the
B into *Q;* making the erroneous reading *Qanaq*.   In ii. 13, the name
Antipas (again see above), by a singular but not unnatural error, is
replaced by a word meaning "that appeared."   The name of the
star Apsinthos (viii. 11) is transliterated, not translated.   In ix. 12,
Abaddon and Apollyon are both attempted to be transliterated, the

first, however, erroneously (again see above), substituting an *'ee* for *aleph* at the beginning, and leaving off the *nun* at the end; as in the case of "Nicolaitans" also.   In xvi. 16 Ἁρμαγεδὼν is likewise transliterated; naturally because the Syrian translator would not recognize the Hebrew "Har Megiddo."   These, with a double form for "Thyatira," one like the Greek dative, are, if I mistake not, all the cases in which the Syriac genius is not strictly followed in the case of the proper names.   It results that in this matter the Syriac Apocalypse is very widely different from the Harklensian genius as shown in White's edition, though not altogether different from that of some of the Harklensian MSS.   My own judgment is that the handling of the proper names shows first a copyist, of a grade much inferior to the original translator; and next, as far as the translator can be discerned, it shows a procedure rather different from the extreme Harklensian method.

2.   Next, as to Greek words not proper names.   Here the Harklensian genius is approached, but by no means fully reached.   The word most frequently accurring is θρόνος; but it is not uniformly transliterated, being sometimes translated by the Syriac ܟܘܪܣܝܐ.   At first it would seem that the translator intended to observe a distinction between the throne of the Almighty and the lesser thrones, by translating for the first and transliterating for the second.   But as one reads the book through, that distinction breaks down, and no other appears to take its place.   The word is translated in i. 4; iv. 2, 3, 4; xvi. 17; xx. 4; and, if I mistake not, transliterated in all the other cases.   Other words are ποδήρη, ζώνην and ζώνας (keeping the acc. sing. and pl. forms); κλεῖδας and κλεῖδα (likewise keeping the Greek terminations); πρόσωπον (but this is familiar in the Peshitto); the names of the several precious stones, and also κρύσταλλος; κιθάρας (acc. pl. form); κιθαρῳδῶν and κιθαρῳδαί (gen. and nom. pl.); φιάλας and φιάλην (acc. sing. and pl.); καῦμα; στολάς (acc. pl.); γωνία; στάδια; ἄκρατων; εὐαγγέλιον (but this is naturalized in Syriac); μουσικοί; ναῦται; κυβερνήτης; λίβανον; ἄμωμον; κιννάμωμον; βύσσος; στρηνία (or στρῆνος), with a verbal form from the same; γένος (but this word is naturalized in all the Orient); τετράγωνος; δόμησις; χοῖνιξ.   Besides there are others where the Greek has been naturalized, but not transliterated, as the words for δηνάρια, δαιμόνια, together with a few doubtful cases; which would of themselves lead to the conclusion that the book was translated from the Greek, even if we did not know the fact otherwise.   Thus οὐαί appears to be transliterated, ܘ to be translated; χαλκολιβάνῳ is partly

translated and partly not, in the phrase ܟܬܒܬ ܟܠܝܠܐ; "in Sardis" is once (ii. 7) rendered "in Paradise" by a scribe's error; and 'Ἀλληλούϊα is pretty surely taken from the Greek form.   To the same class may belong such cases as a Syriac participle for ὁ κατηγορῶν, formed anew from an adopted Greek word; the distorted form for μαργαρίται; and the possibly coincident ܣܩܐ for σάκκος. To the usual Greek particles (γάρ, δέ, &c.) is to be added also μέν.

The list here given covers nearly all the cases in kind.   It shows plainly a coincidence with the Harklensian method in one respect, viz., in representing Greek case-endings* now and then; and the transliterated μέν looks in the same direction.   But this matter is not to be judged altogether by what it shows affirmatively.   It is to be compared with the general Harklensian usage, especially in its extent; a thing to be properly treated of in another connection.   For the present it is enough to say that in respect to Greek words, the divergence of the Apocalypse from the Peshitto is not so great as from the Harklensian, but apparently greater (though the basis of comparison here is inadequate) than from the Pococke Epistles.   The testimony of the Greek words, positive and negative, apparently tends on the whole to show that the Apocalypse is not a piece of the Harklensian as we have it; though the difference might be accounted for by remembering one very apparent fact; that it had no Peshitto basis.   In some of its verbal translations it is nearer the Peshitto than to the Harklensian.

It is to be remembered, too, that the use of a Greek word where a native Syriac word might have been used, decides nothing.   The only force, one way or the other, of this consideration lies in the *prevailing fashion* of the transliterating of words from the Greek text. To me, the case stands thus: neither the proper names nor the other words retained in the Syriac Apocalypse show any real connection with the Harklensian; but only an attempt to be faithful to the Greek original.   If they are to be taken as showing a dependence upon or close connection with the Harklensian, then many a secular composition must fall into the same category, including some that antedate the Harklensian.

(The remaining portions of this paper await some further verification and revision, and will appear in a future number of the Journal.)

---

* But discretion is needed on this point.   The Peshitto itself sometimes reproduces Greek case-endings, *e.. g.* of στάσις in Luke xxiii. 19, 25; and of στάσιν in Mark xv. 7.

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

Proceedings in June, 1882.

The Society held its fifth meeting according to appointment in the Library of the Yale Divinity School, New Haven, on Thursday, June 1st, 1882, at 2:30 P. M.

There were present during the meeting Profs. Beckwith, Brown, Day, Dwight, Fisher, Gardiner, Gould, Hall, Mitchell, Prentice, Schaff, Toy, Rev. S. M. Jackson, and Rev. Drs. Chambers, Harwood, Mombert, and Todd.

In the absence of the President and Vice-President, Prof. Day was chosen President *pro tem*.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The Secretary read extracts from a number of letters expressing regret of various members at their unavoidable absence.

He also reported upon the printing and distribution of the Journal.

An invitation was received from Prof. Wier to attend a reception at the Yale School of the Fine Arts at 8½ o'clock this evening. This invitation was accepted with thanks, and tickets were given to the members present.

Voted, That the election of officers and the transaction of the general business of the Society be made the order of the day for 7 P. M., and that a committee on the nomination of officers be appointed by the chair. The chair appointed as such committee Drs. Toy, Brown, and Todd.

At 3:20 the first paper was read by Prof. George Prentice, D. D., on "The peculiarities in the mind of Christ," and the ensuing discussion continued until 4:55.

The next paper was read by Prof. I. H. Hall, Ph. D., on "The Beirût MS." At 6 P. M., this paper being unfinished, a recess was taken until 7 P. M.

On the reassembling of the Society at 7:15 P. M., the committee on the nomination of officers reported, recommending the reëlection of the

existing officers. The report was accepted, and the following officers were duly elected:

REV. D. R. GOODWIN, D. D., LL. D., - - - *President.*
REV. JAMES STRONG, D. D., - - - - *Vice-President.*
REV. F. GARDINER, D. D., - - - - - *Secretary.*
REV. C. A. BRIGGS, D. D., - - - - *Treasurer.*
REV. EZRA ABBOT, D. D., LL. D., ⎫
REV. GEO. E. DAY, D. D., ⎪ *Additional Members*
REV. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, D. D., ⎬
PROF. CHARLES SHORT, D. D., ⎪ *of the Council.*
REV. C. M. MEAD, Ph. D., ⎭

The Report of the Treasurer was presented by Prof. Brown, and referred to an auditing committee appointed by the President, consisting of Profs. Prentice and Gould.

After discussion, it was voted that an hour, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be set apart at each meeting for such short notes and reports in the line of our work as may be presented by members, without being entered on the programme of the meeting. The hour immediately following the completion of Prof. Hall's paper was set apart for this purpose at the present meeting.

The auditors reported that the Treasurer's report was correct and duly vouched.

Prof. Hall's paper was continued at 7:35 and discussed until 8:25.

Adjourned to attend the reception at the School of Fine Arts, and meet again at 9 A. M.

Friday, June 2d. The Society reassembled at 9 A. M.

In the absence of the President *pro tem.*, the Rev. Dr. Harwood was invited to take the chair, which he gave up to Dr. Day on his return.

This being the hour for short papers and notes,

A note on Lenormant's *Les Origines de l'Histoire*, vol. II., chapter on Ararat and Eden, was read by Dr. Toy.

A note on S. Mark xii. 10, 11, was read by Prof. Hall.

A note on a recent criticism on *The text, structure and authorship of the Apocalypse*, by Völter, was read by the Rev. S. M. Jackson.

Dr. Schaff spoke at some length on Weiss' *Leben Jesu.*

Dr. Dwight spoke on the Synoptical Gospels, especially S. Mark.

Dr. Mombert read a note on the place of the printing of Tyndale's version, and on his study of Hebrew.

These notes, with the discussions to which they gave rise, occupied until 10:30 A. M. The hour having thus more than expired, other notes were deferred.

The next paper was read by the Rev. J. I. Mombert, D. D., on Job xix. 15–27, and was discussed until 11:25.

The Rev. Dr. Dwight then paid a tribute to the memory of our late

colleague, the Rev. J. K. Burr, D. D., of Trenton, New Jersey, and was followed by Drs. Day, Schaff, and others.

On motion, Drs. Short and Dwight were appointed a committee to prepare a minute in relation to the death of Dr. Burr, to be entered on our Journal, and to be sent to his family.

The minute, as subsequently prepared, is as follows:

WHEREAS, it has pleased Almighty God to remove by death the Rev. J. K. Burr, D. D., our esteemed fellow-member, who was chosen as our associate for his learning and ability, we desire to place on record our sense of the loss which this Society has thus sustained.

Dr. Burr had won the regard of all that were associated with him, by his devoted piety, by his scholarship, of which he had given signal proof in an excellent commentary on a part of Holy Scripture, by his modesty, his calm judgment, and his gentle and truly Christian spirit. Though continually suffering from ill health during the last years of his life, he was still faithful to every duty, and attended, even till their work was completed, the meetings of the Committee of Bible Revision, of which he was an esteemed member.

The devotion of his life to the highest studies, to the worthiest causes, and to the best institutions, will be kept in grateful remembrance by many who knew and honored him.

This society tenders to his family and friends its sincere sympathy in their painful bereavement.

<div style="text-align:right">CHARLES SHORT, } Committee.
TIMOTHY DWIGHT, }</div>

The following minute was, on motion, unanimously adopted:

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis desires to express its interest in the Syriac MS., belonging to the Syrian Protestant College at Beirût, of which Prof. Hall has given an account, and its hope that this important document may be printed and published. Its early date, the fact that it includes nearly the whole of the New Testament, and the apparent priority of its text over the Harklean, make it desirable that the text should be in the hands of scholars.

Further, the Society would express the hope that the Codex itself may remain in this country, where it may be accessible to a larger number of scholars. We therefore respectfully request the present owners of the MS. to take into consideration the propriety of depositing it in some fire-proof building in this country.

The Council reported the place and time for the next meeting as New York, at the Union Theological Seminary, during the Christmas holidays, at such day and hour as may be fixed by a committee consisting of Profs. Briggs, Schaff, and Brown.

The Council recommended the following persons for election as members of the Society, all of whom have published works or articles on subjects connected with the work of the Society. They were thereupon duly elected, and have since signified their acceptance of membership:

Prof. Wm. Arnold Stevens,	Rochester Theol. Sem., Rochester, N. Y.
Prof. W. R. Harper,	Baptist Union Theol. Sem., Morgan Park, Chicago.
Prof. W. G. Ballantine,	Oberlin Theol. Sem., Oberlin, Ohio.
Prof. Geo. H. Schodde,	Columbus, Ohio.
Prof. Edward L. Curtis,	Presby. Theol. Sem. of the Northwest, 1060 North Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.
Prof. O. S. Stearns, D. D.,	Newton Theol. Sem., Newton Centre, Mass.
Prof. Rufus P. Stebbins, D. D.,	Newton Centre, Mass.
Rev. Edward H. Jewett, D. D.,	Norwich, Conn.
Prof. Edwin C. Bissell,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. Revere F. Wiedner,	Rock Island, Ill.

Voted, That the whole question of printing the proceedings be referred to the Council with power.

Voted, That the Secretary be authorized to dispose of copies of the Journal and Proceedings to members, for foreign distribution only, at fifty cents each.

The next paper on " Tenses in Conditional Sentences in Hebrew," by the Rev. Henry Ferguson, in the absence of the author, was read by the Secretary.

The last paper on " Lost Hebrew Manuscripts," by the Rev. Bernard Pick, Ph. D., in his absence, was read by Prof. Brown, beginning at 12:30.

After the reading of the rough minutes, at 1:30 P. M., the Society adjourned.

FREDERIC GARDINER,
Secretary.

December, 1882.

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis held its sixth meeting according to appointment in the chapel of the Union Theological Seminary, 9 University Place, New York, at 10 A. M., December 28th, 1882, the President being in the chair.

The following members were present during the session: Profs. Beckwith, Beecher, Bissell, Briggs, Brown, President Cattell, Rev. Dr. Chambers, President Chase, Rev. Dr. Craven, Chancellor Crosby, Prof. Day, Rev. Henry Ferguson, Profs. Gardiner, Goodwin, Hall, Hart, Hitchcock, Rev. S. M. Jackson, Rev. Dr. Jewett, Prof. Mitchell, Rev. Dr. Mombert, Profs. Paine, Schaff, and Short; in all, twenty-four.

The minutes of the last meeting were read, corrected, and then approved.

The Committee on Arrangements reported that they had provided for a recess from 1 to 2 P. M., followed by the hour for short notes, and then by the business of the meeting, with another recess from 6 to 7½ P. M. This report was accepted and the arrangement adopted.

The first paper was then read by the Rev. Elijah R. Craven, D. D., on 1 Tim. iv. 1–5, beginning at 10:25, and was discussed until 11:35.

The next paper, on "The Argument *e silentio*," was postponed, at the request of the author, until the next meeting.

The next paper, on "The Testimony of the New Testament to the Authorship of the Old Testament Books," by Prof. Francis Brown, occupied until the hour of recess, at 1 P. M.

The Society reassembled at 2 P. M.

A number of extracts from letters of absent members, regretting their unavoidable absence, were read.

Short notes were then given as follows: By Prof. Gardiner, on the mention of Daniel by the Prophet Ezekiel, and the reasons therefor. By Prof. Brown, on the "History of the Beginnings of Semitic Civilization," by Fritz Hummel. By the Rev. S. M. Jackson, on a book on "The Medical Language of St. Luke," by Dr. Hobart. By Prof. Gardiner, on the time occupied and the numbers involved in the deportations of the Jews by Nebuchadnezzar. These notes, and the discussions upon them, occupied until 2:50 P. M.

The Council then presented its report, fixing the time and place of the next meeting as the first week in June, 1883, at Middletown, Conn.

They also stated that a selection of the papers read at this and the preceding meeting could now be published in another number of the Journal, the funds in the treasury being sufficient for the printing of about 200 pages.

They recommended the following persons for election as members, who were thereupon duly elected, and have since signified their acceptance of membership.

Rev. Wm. Henry Cobb,   Uxbridge, Mass.
Rev. F. G. Hibbard, D. D.,   Clifton Springs, New York.
Prof. A. B. Hyde,   Alleghany Coll., Meadville, Pa.
Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph. D.,   15 Appian Way, Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. R. W. Micou,   Waterbury, Conn.
Rev. D. Steele, D. D.,   Reading, Mass.
Rev. Milton S. Terry,   249 West 23d St., New York.
Prof. B. B. Warfield, D. D., LL. D., Allegheny Sem., Allegheny, Pa.

At 3:05 P. M. the discussion began on Prof. Brown's paper, and was continued until 4:42, when, at the request of several members unable to be present at this hour, further discussion was adjourned until the evening.

The next paper was then read by Prof. I. H. Hall, Ph. D., on the Syriac Apocalypse, occupying, with its discussion, until the hour of recess.

The Society reassembled at 7:30 P. M. In the absence of the President and Vice-President, the Rev. E. R. Craven, D. D., was chosen President *pro tem*.

At 7:45 P. M. the next paper was read by Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D., on בְּרִיא in Josh. xvii. 15, 18, and Ezek. xxi. 24; xxiii. 47, occupying, with its discussion, until 8:20.

The last paper, by Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph. D., on "Hand uplifting as a religious ceremony," was read by the Secretary.

Dr. Craven being obliged to leave soon afterwards, Prof. E. C. Bissell was chosen President *pro tem*.

The discussion of Prof. Brown's paper was then resumed and continued until 9:40 P. M.

The rough minutes of the meeting were read, after which the Society adjourned.

FREDERIC GARDINER, *Secretary*.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

Prof. Ezra Abbot, D.D., LL.D., 23 Berkeley St., Cambridge, Mass.
Very Rev. Dean Maurice Baldwin, Montreal, Canada.
Prof. W. G. Ballantine,   Oberlin Theol. Sem., Oberlin, Ohio.
President S. C. Bartlett, D. D., LL. D., Dartmouth Coll., Hanover, N. H.
Prof. I. T. Beckwith, Ph. D.,   Hartford, Conn.
Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.,   Auburn, New York.
Prof. John Binney,   Middletown, Conn.
Prof. Edwin C. Bissell, D. D.,   Hartford, Conn.
Prof. C. A. Briggs, D. D.,   Union Theol. Sem., New York.
Prof. Francis Brown,   Union Theol. Sem., New York.
Prof. J. H. Buttz, D. D.,   Madison, New Jersey.
President W. C. Cattell, D. D.,   Lafayette Coll., Easton, Penn.
Rev. T. W. Chambers, D. D.,   70 West 36th St., New York.
President Thos. Chase, LL. D.,   Haverford Coll., Delaware Co., Penn.
Rev. Wm. Henry Cobb,   Uxbridge, Mass.
Chanc'r Howard Crosby, D. D., LL. D., 116 19th St., New York.
Rev. Elijah R. Craven, D. D.,   Newark, New Jersey.
Prof. S. Ives Curtiss, D. D.,   364 W. Washington St., Chicago, Ill.
Prof. Ed. L. Curtis,   Pres. Theol. Sem. of N. W., 1060 North Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.

Prof. Geo. E. Day, D. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. John De Witt, D. D.,	Theol. Sem. of Ref'd Dutch Church, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
Prof. Timothy Dwight, D. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. Geo. McI. Du Bois,	1617 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. L. I. Evans, D. D.,	Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Prof. Henry Ferguson,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. Geo. P. Fisher, D. D., LL. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Prof. Frederic Gardiner, D. D.,	Middletown, Conn.
Prof. D. R. Goodwin, D. D., LL. D.,	3927 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. E. P. Gould,	Newton Centre, Mass.
Prof. Isaac H. Hall, Ph. D.,	725 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. W. R. Harper,	Baptist Union Theol. Sem., Morgan Park, (near Chicago), Ill.
Prof. Samuel Hart,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. C. D. Hartranft, D. D.,	Hartford, Conn., (Box 524).
Rev. E. Harwood, D. D.,	New Haven, Conn.
Rev. F. G. Hibbard, D. D.,	Clifton Springs, New York.
Prof. R. D. Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D.,	Union Theol. Sem., New York, N. Y.
Prof. A. B. Hyde, D. D.,	Alleghany Coll., Meadville, Penn.
Rev. S. M. Jackson,	42 Bible House, New York.
Rev. Ed. H. Jewett, D. D.,	Norwich, Conn.
*Prov't C. P. Krauth, LL. D.,	University of Pa., Philadelphia, Penn.
Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph. D.,	15 Appian Way, Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. C. M. Mead, Ph. D.,	Andover, Mass.
Prof. Selah Merrill, D. D.,	Jerusalem, Syria.
Rev. R. W. Micou,	Waterbury, Conn.
Prof. H. G. T. Mitchell, Ph. D.,	Middletown, Conn.
Rev. J. I. Mombert, D. D.,	Paterson, New Jersey.
Prof. Howard Osgood, D. D.,	Rochester, New York.
Prof. John A. Paine, Ph. D.,	Tarrytown, New York.
Rev. Bernard Pick, Ph. D.,	Allegheny, Pa.
Prof. George Prentice, D. D.,	Middletown, Conn.
Rev. E. W. Rice,	1122 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Thomas H. Rich,	Bates Coll., Lewiston, Maine.
Prof. M. B. Riddle, D. D.,	Hartford, Conn.
Prof. C. J. H. Ropes,	Bangor, Me.
Prof. P. Schaff, D. D., LL. D.,	42 Bible House, New York.
Prof. Geo. H. Schodde,	Columbus, Ohio.
Prof. Charles Short, LL. D.,	24 West 60th St., New York.
Prof. H. P. Smith,	Lane Theol. Sem., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Prof. O. S. Stearns, D. D.,	Newton Theol. Sem., Newton Centre, Mass.

* Died January 2d, 1883.

Prof. Rufus P. Stebbins, D. D., Newton Centre, Mass.
Rev. D. Steele, D. D., Reading, Mass.
Prof. P. H. Steenstra, Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. Wm. Arnold Stevens, Rochester Theol. Sem., Rochester, N. Y.
Prof. James Strong, D. D., LL. D., Madison, New Jersey.
Rev. Milton S. Terry, D. D., 249 West 23d St., New York, N. Y.
Prof. J. H. Thayer, D. D., Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. John E. Todd, D. D., New Haven, Conn.
Prof. C. H. Toy, D. D., Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, D. D., 37 East 35th St., New York, N. Y.
Rev. W. H. Ward, D. D., Office of *Independent*, New York, N. Y.
Prof. B. B. Warfield, D. D., LL. D., Allegheny Sem., Allegheny, Penn.
Prof. Revere F. Weidner, Rock Island, Ill.
Prof. Henry R. Weston, D. D., Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Penn.

The December meeting of the Society will be held in New York during the Christmas holidays at such place and on such day as may be appointed by a committee consisting of Drs. Short, Briggs, and Schaaf.

ERRATA.

Further Corrections and Additions for the Number for June and December, 1881.

Page 4, l. 3, and p, 7, note, l. 2 from bottom, *for* Wace *read* Bishop Jackson

" 5, 2d par., line 12, "homage." Add as a note:—See also Acts iii. 20:—"and that he may *send* the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus."

" 12, l. 9 from bottom, dele the clause beginning "Westcott and Hort" and ending with "margin;"

" 13, end of 2d paragraph, add:—It is, however, represented in the margin of Westcott and Hort's edition of the N. T. in Greek.

" 19, 2d paragraph, l. 9, *for* Professor Wace *read* The Bishop of London

" 56, 3d stanza, *for* our *read* out

" 57, l. 3 from bottom, *for* Tanaach *read* Taanach

" 98, note, l. 2 from bottom, *after* v. *insert* pars ii.

" 101, at the end of 3d paragraph (l. 6 from bottom) add:—See also Iren. *Haer.* iv. 4. § 1: ἐξ αὐτῶν γὰρ τ ὸ κ α τ ὰ σ ά ρ κ α ὁ χριστὸς ἐκαρποφορήθη, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι (mistranslated in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library); and Frag. xvii. ed. Stieren, p. 836:—ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Λευὶ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα τ ὸ κ α τ ὰ σ ά ρ κ α, ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεύς, ἐγεννήθη [ὁ χριστός].

" 106, note, last line, *for* § 6 *read* § 7

" 109, l. 5, *for* and still less *read* or

" 127, l. 10 from bottom, *for* subject *read* object

" 137, end of 2d par., add:—See p. 126, note †.

" 141, 2d par., l. 3, *for* notice *read* take up

" 144, last par., 1st sentence, *dele* which . . . *laudandus*, and 2d sentence, omit 'also' and insert 'a little' before 'ambiguous.'

" 145, 2d par., l. 1, *for* Others *read* Among those *and l.* 2 *insert* and *before* Dr.

" 146, 2d par., 1st sentence, *add* and *Neutest. Theol.* (1864), p. 194.

" 147, 3d par. l. 1, *before* Prof. J. H. SCHOLTEN insert:—EWALD, *Die Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus* u. s. w. (1857), translates: —": der über allen ist Gott sei gelobet in die ewigkeiten, Amén!" (p. 323, comp. p. 398 f.) See also his *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, Bd. iii. (1874), p. 416, n. 3.

" 151, add to the note respecting the punctuation of Rom. ix. 5 in the Vatican MS. (B):—Since the above was printed, the point after σάρκα has been very carefully examined by Professor Ubaldo Ubaldi, of the Collegio Romano, and Father Cozza, one of the editors of the Vatican MS. They compared it, at my suggestion, with the 12 points represented in the printed edition of the MS. on the same page (1453), and also with the points, unquestionably *a prima manu*, after οφείλημα, Rom. iv. 4, and after κεῖται, 2 Cor. iii. 15. The result is that the point after σάρκα is undoubtedly by the first hand, the pale ink of the original being only partially covered, as in other cases on the same page, by the black ink of the late scribe who retouched the ancient writing throughout the manuscript.

It may be added, that out of six cursive MSS. examined for me by Dr. C. R. Gregory, viz. Brit. Mus. Add. 5116, 7142, 11837, 17469, Curzon 71. 6, and Act. 20 (Paul. 25), all but the last have a colon after σάρκα, and the last MS. is almost illegible in this place.

" 153, 2d par., l. 4, *before* 1 Sam. *insert* Ruth ii. 20;

∼∼∼∼∼∼∼∼∼

Also in the present number:

Page 26, 6th line, *read* 1630 *instead of* 1627

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

———◆———

JUNE.

DECEMBER.

PROCEEDINGS.

Copies of the *Journal* may be obtained of the Secretary, Prof. H. G. T. Mitchell, Ph. D., Middletown, Conn., at the price of three dollars. Persons who have become members since the publication of the *Journal* for 1881, may obtain copies of that publication of the Secretary at the price of one dollar.